


UNIVERSITY OF ST. MICHAEL'S COLLEGE



3 1761 07097430 8



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2007 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

The Catholic University Bulletin.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

VOLUME IX—1903.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

VOL. IX.

JANUARY, 1903.

No. 1.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

THE INSTITUTE OF MEDICAL STUDIES
10 ELMSLEY PLACE
TORONTO 5, CANADA,

OCT 10 1931

WITHDRAWN

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

AUG 27 1960

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. IX.

January, 1903.

No. 1.

THE OLD ENGLISH CHANTRY.

To the general student of English history the chantry system is a subject quite unfamiliar. Even to those who make the history of the English medieval church a special object of study the question is, as a rule, but little known; while to the casual reader of English life in past ages the very word itself, chantry, is new and insignificant. The guilds, those great benefit-societies of the Middle Ages, the Lollardy movement, and those magnificent "agricultural, industrial and literary republics," the monasteries, have all attracted to themselves a number of distinguished writers, who have set forth in detail their rise, development, influence and decline. But the chantry has been allowed to remain in obscurity.

Now why this neglect of an institution which, according to Mgr. Moyes, is among the most notable features in pre-Reformation England? The little attention given to it in early days is due, no doubt, to the character of most history writing. A perusal of the histories of Gibbon or Macaulay or Hume gives a good idea of the old style. These men seem to have been occupied with what are called the great questions—with the life and environment of kings and heroes and eminent men. All else was set aside as unworthy of attention or was considered merely as a background for the great life or event to be depicted. Naturally in the works of such men a subject so devoid of external glamor as the chantry is, could have but little place. For there is nothing in it to tempt the writer of high-sounding

periods, no glowing scenes to be described, no achievements calculated to arouse popular enthusiasm.

But how does it happen that in these latter days, at a time when historians seek to give us a glimpse of the life of the great mass of the people—as they bought and sold, joyed and sorrowed, labored and suffered and prayed—how is it, I ask, that in such works a paragraph usually sums up all that is worth saying on the subject? This question indeed is not so easy to answer. It may be remarked however that most of the writers who have occupied themselves with that period of English history are men of an immeasurably different religious spirit from the people of the time of which they speak, men who, in their writings, may have been animated with an “objective sense of justice,” but who have lacked the sympathy necessary for a right understanding of the life and customs of the Catholics of pre-Reformation days. Without this sympathy, without a belief in the existence of purgatory, without an ability to enter into the intense religious life of the people, a life in which the things of faith were realized as clearly as “the merchant now realizes the market place and his bales of merchandise,” it is very difficult to rightly understand a religious institution of the chantry character. Then again, it is to be noted that materials bearing on the question of the chantry are not so abundant as is desirable. True the archives of the British Museum, and the parish churches and cathedrals scattered throughout the kingdom, are rich in these data, but as yet only a comparatively small part of them has been printed or even calendered. This valuable work is now under way. But because of the many difficulties which beset such a task, and because of the small number of men capable of properly performing it, its progress is slow.

By what has been just said, however, I would not be understood as implying that our present materials are so inadequate as to prevent the student from securing a fairly accurate notion of the chantry system. Such an impression would be erroneous. Thanks to the publications of the different English historical and archaeological societies—of the Surtees Society, the Chetham Society, the Somerset Society, the Yorkshire Archaeological Society and many others—and to the learned intro-

ductions written to the different publications by eminent scholars, much light has been thrown on the question. The wills, church-warden accounts and commissioners' reports, thus far published, though by no means complete, give us at first hand an interesting picture of the social and religious condition of the people of those days. And although the future labors of these different learned societies will, no doubt, serve to bring out in clearer light the different details of this picture, already, in accuracy and color, they are such as to furnish us with no faint notion of the nature and influence of the chantry institution.

Briefly, a chantry¹ as it existed in England, was the endowment of one or more priests, charged with the performance of certain duties, usually, though not necessarily, set down by the founder in a deed of foundation. These duties might be many or few according to the will of the testator. One only was essential, and that one was the office of reading or singing mass for the soul of the donor, or for the souls of persons named by him, a function which was performed in a chapel built specially for the purpose, or at an altar already existing in some parish church or cathedral.

It is clear from this definition that the chantry was a religious institution, primarily though not solely—a means which persons took to insure, in so far as they were able, the eternal welfare of their souls. But the chantry was not the only institution erected with a view to this spiritual benefit. From early medieval times nobles and rich gentry had founded or contributed to the foundation of monasteries, animated, in part at least, by the thought of the eternal favors to be derived from the prayers of those who had been assisted. Built in the quiet depths of the primeval forest, or in the very heart of villages and towns, raised and supported in answer to the generous promptings of hearts overflowing with religious interests, those homes of prayer, industry, and agriculture, art, science and literature, carried on for centuries their glorious work of

¹ The different forms of the word chantry as found in Murray's Dictionary are: 4-5 Chanuterie; 4-6 try; 5 chaunterye; 5-6 Chauntery-e; 6 chauntrie, trye, chawntary, chanterie (schawittry, schawnter); 6-7 chauntery; 7 chantrie; 5-9 chauntrig; 5 chantry (M. E. Chaunterie; O. F. chanterie; F. chanter—to sing; M. L. Cantaria, cantuaria, whence cantarie, cantuarie).

building up the solid structure of England's power and greatness.

But there came a time in the course of events when religious fervor and zeal ceased to find their expression in the monastic establishment. After the year 1350 we search the records in vain for traces of this form of endowment. At about that period the social and religious condition of the English people underwent a tremendous change. The transformation was mainly brought about by a series of overwhelming calamities which fell upon England, in common with the rest of Europe, in the middle of the fourteenth century. The first one, known as the Black Death, so called from the dark blotches which appeared on the skin of the person afflicted, was by far the most terrible. It first made its appearance in the ports of Bristol and Southampton in August, 1348, and thence its deadly breath was quickly wafted all over the land. Blackened and disfigured corpses to the number of one half the population made the island one vast charnel house.

The effects of this and the two succeeding plagues in the religious world were of the nature of a revolution. At first a dull despair fastened itself upon all; and writers of the period agree in their descriptions of the dissoluteness and corruption which for a time prevailed. But such a deplorable condition of affairs could not long exist in a nation in whose heart the fires of faith had for centuries so brightly burned. A great religious awakening soon took place. A new religious spirit seems suddenly to have grown up among the people, a spirit marked by its devotional and self-reflective character and finding its expression in a number of religious practices hitherto but indifferently popular.

Among these, the devotion to the souls in purgatory, a devotion old and dear to Catholic hearts, had a special attraction. And this is not to be wondered at. For the pre-Reformation English were a deeply religious people. Religion indeed was the sunlight of their lives, the very soul of their commonest daily duties. The doctrines and practices of the Catholic Church had taken a firm hold on the minds and hearts of all. Her Christian ideals, her teaching on the Christian brotherhood of man, her doctrines on the efficacy of prayer and good works

for salvation and on the communion of saints were, in reality, the very cornerstone of their whole social fabric. It was, therefore, only natural, when the "awful cruelty of death" had left its dreaded trace on every side, that the nation should turn with intense ardor to the church's consoling teaching with regard to the holy souls—that those whom the "fell mortality" had spared should strive with the means which the church held out, to secure the eternal rest of the souls of the dear ones whom the plague had taken away. Now this increased devotion to the holy souls, following on the plagues, found its expression in many ways but in none more markedly than in the foundation of chantries. The chantry foundation did not of course take its rise at that time. Long before the Black Death, even before the Conquest, traces of the chantry are discernible, while throughout the thirteenth and especially during the first half of the fourteenth centuries large numbers were erected. Nor did the chantries founded after the passage of the great pestilence spring up solely in answer to the devotion to the holy souls. Indeed after the plagues, owing to more equal distribution of wealth, to the growing importance of the middle class and to the decrease in popularity of the monastic establishment, motives of a less spiritual character may be said to have exercised a stronger influence than ever before. This fact has been lost sight of by many men who have regarded chantries "as illustrative of the extent to which the necessity of praying for the dead was impressed upon the people, by ecclesiastical authorities and that with a view to their own profit," yet it is important for a just appreciation of the institution.

Conspicuous among these other motives was "that pride which hopes still to exact homage in its ashes and to live in an inscription." For just as in ancient times the desire to be remembered found expression in the stately arch, the graceful statue or the animated bust, and just as to-day this same craving leads to the foundation of universities and the establishment of libraries, so in the days of faith and piety of which we are speaking it moved men to choose as fitting memorial the chantry and its priest; and though there can be no doubt that many of these chantries were erected for this end by men who during life had done no deed worthy of the grateful memory of

posterity yet, at the same time, it is equally certain that not a few of them were raised by a loving and admiring people and stood as monuments, meant to be perpetual, to "the best and holiest and most venerated names in the long roll of English men of honor."

Again, in a large number of instances, the chantry speaks the ardent desire of zealous souls to increase God's earthly glory by adding to the number of ministers in the cathedrals and parish churches. In our day when so many causes have tended to weaken the delicate spiritual sense it is difficult to realize the religious fervor of souls in an age when men lived in the divine presence, when men remembered God, sought God and saw God everywhere. A cold, barren religious service, such as the Reformation has forced upon the world, could not satisfy the cravings of the hearts of such a people. The most magnificent churches, the most sumptuous furniture, the most artistic decorations, the most solemn ceremonies, the most gorgeous vestments, a numerous and complex staff of endowed ministers, all that goes to arouse the imagination and to inflame the heart, were deemed essential; and no expense was spared, no labor was thought excessive, which would lead to their possession. In response to religious promptings such as these, we are not surprised to find that many a chantry was founded that the priest thereof might, "syng in the quyer and help in the doyngs of all divine service," or "to the praise of God, and in honor of the Saviour and the name of Jesus and also that divine service might be increased and augmented."²

Then again many chantries were erected by pious founders as a means of fulfilling actual social and religious needs. Thus it was that the demand for grammar schools led many to establish chantry foundations which took on the educational aspect; thus it was that the wretched condition of the jails, where men were "caged like dogs and fed like hogs," caused persons of ardent faith and munificent charity to erect chantries that the "prysoners of the gaole" might have the aid and consolations of the priest; thus it was that the

² These chantries were erected in the county palatine of Lancaster and are dated 1506. This is probably the most common reason assigned by Edward the Sixth's commissioners for the existence of chantries.

pitiful condition of the sick and the destitute, the feeble and the aged induced generous benefactors to erect chantries in the hospitals that the inmates might have the ministrations, material as well as spiritual, of the incumbent; so it was that the many cases of death without the last sacraments impelled religious souls to found chantries in places distant from the parish church thus giving them the character of chapels of ease; thus it was that the needs of those making pilgrimages, a devotion very popular in pre-reformation days, led devout souls to erect wayside chapels. Many of these last were erected at the entrance to bridges, or more frequently on the central pier of the bridge, and a welcome sight to the weary pilgrim must have been the lone lamp just mitigating the chapel gloom. Indeed few there were in those days who entered not to seek strength and consolation on the way.³

Still another fruitful source of chantry foundations was the great demand for domestic chapels. These domestic chapels were nothing new in English life. For centuries noble families had maintained priests who celebrated religious services in the castles or manor houses—an arrangement which excused the founders, except on rare and specified occasions, from the obligation of attending the parish church. Now with the increase of wealth of the middle class, for which the century after the pestilences was conspicuous, many rich yeomen coveted these same privileges. Besides, a domestic chapel with a resident priest brought to a household a certain dignity which those who felt themselves able were not slow to seek. But the conditions necessary for the erection of a regular domestic chapel were many and serious; so to escape these difficulties many families had chapels built under the convenient form of the chantry.⁴

³ A very fine example of such a bridge chapel is seen in the *Journal of Archaeological Association*, 1864, by F. R. Wilson where is described the chapel on the bridge over the Calder, at Wakefield, in Yorkshire, on the road between the much frequented abbeys and shrines.

⁴ Here is an example of the foundation of a domestic chapel under the guise of a chantry, taken from Cutts "Parish Priests, etc.," p. 724. "Sir G. de Brante, in right of Joanne his wife, had liberty given him by Robert dean of St. Paul's, with the consent of Walter Niger, Vicar of Navestock, Essex, to found a chapel and *chantry* in his court at Navestock, provided he and his heirs maintain a chaplain at his own expense, sworn to preserve the liberty of the mother church, and to pay the vicar all the profits he should receive there, and admit none of the parishioners to confession or other offices under pain of being suspended by the bishop. The founder also and the heirs of the said Joanne his wife, and whoever else had the said chapel in his lordship, were also to be sworn

From the number and variety of the motives leading to the foundation of chantries we may readily understand that the movement was widespread. Thus we find archbishops, bishops, canons, deans and vicars choral, even the chantry priests themselves, when able, all making provision for the chantry establishment. But the movement was by no means confined to the clerical body. Among the laity it was equally popular. The successful merchant whose business ability and growing wealth made his name a household word with the people of the town in which he lived; the knight whose deeds of valor were the subject of praise throughout the land; the noble, whose impregnable castle dominated from some summit the poor wattled huts of the villagers; the very kings of the realm, not even excluding Henry VIII himself, willed that chantries should be erected in their honor and for the good of their souls. And where an individual was unable of himself to secure the much-desired object he united with others for the purpose.⁵ Indeed most of the guilds that arose during this period were associations formed mainly in view of the chantry establishment and deserve the name, given them by a recent writer, of "coöperative chantries."⁶ Thus high and low, rich and poor throughout the length and breadth of the land were directly or indirectly occupied in the erection and maintenance of these foundations.

As a result of this universal interest we find that in 1547 when Edward VI ordered their suppression, there were, according to Peter Heylin in his "*Ecclesiastica Restaurata*," no less than 2,347 of them. Nor is this estimate by any means over the

to preserve the rights of the mother church under like pain. In which chapel the chaplain was to administer the mass only, with bread and holy water (sic) forbearing all other holy offices, saving that at Easter the founder and his wife and heirs, together with her free servants and guests, were to be admitted to the sacrament of the altar; but all his servants were to go to the mother church throughout the year.

⁵*E. g.*, "The chauntre of Donatyve at Saynt James auter in the church of Yycall. John Clowdesdale, incumbent. The sayd chauntre is founded by the inhabitantes ther of ther devocion to pray for the prosperyty of parochiners and all crysten sowles, and to kepe the quier in the sayd church at all devyne service, & the landes gyven to the sayd chauntre by severall persons of the parochiners ther. The same chauntre is in the sayd church. The necessete is to helpe the curate to mynyster sacramentes to the parochyans, ther beyng in number of c c c howslynge people and above." Extract from commissioners' reports for Yorkshire. Page, William: "*Yorkshire Chantry Surveys*," 2 vols., London, 1898; Vol. I, p. 58.

⁶ See Ashley, "Eng. Econ. Hist.," Vol. II, pp. 37, 38 req.

mark. To the contrary, we have every reason to believe that when all the certificates and records scattered throughout England are printed, we shall find the total number of the chantries somewhat larger than Heylin's calculation. The records thus far published however show us that the distribution of the chantries throughout the land was unequal. We learn for example that in Yorkshire, one of the richest and most populous districts in England, there were 402 such foundations, while, according to the publications of the Chetham Society, the Commissioners of Edward VI report only ninety for the poor and sparsely inhabited county of Lancaster.⁷ Again in towns with cathedrals served by secular canons we find that chantries existed, as a rule, in large numbers,⁸ whereas only a few are given for places where monks were in charge.⁹

As to the location of the chantry chapels there was nothing defined. We have a great many examples of them standing as detached buildings in out of the way places or in churchyards or in cloister courts. Chantries of this kind were sometimes of two stories, the lower one being devoted to the strictly religious services of the foundation, while the incumbent used the upper floor as his home or as a school room. But in most cases the chantry chapel was a part of the parish church or cathedral. Sometimes it was an addition made to the choir and opening into it, while at other times it was made by screening off a space between the great pillars of the nave or transept. This latter method seems to have been the most popular. In such a case the altar was erected usually under a window with a lavatory adjoining. Room was left for the priest to celebrate and an acolyte to serve, while those who attended the service stood or knelt outside.

At times the number of these foundations in parish churches was so large that the church was absorbed, as it were, and became what was called a chantry college, or collegiate church. By this it is not meant that the church became an educational institution. True, some did take on this character. But ordi-

⁷ In these reports we must remember that many chantries had been concealed by the owners and by the priests and were not published in the Commissioners' lists.

⁸ St. Paul's, London, had 54 at the time of the suppression.

⁹ Durham, Ely, Norwich, Worcester, Winchester, had none. See Cutts, "Parish Priests," p. 443.

narly by collegiate church is simply meant an association of chantry priests living together under the same roof and having one of their number called warden or dean, for superior. By this change of the aspect of the parish church, parochial duties were not neglected. On the contrary, with the dean as rector and the cure of souls discharged by one or more of the chantry priests acting in the capacity of vicars, the religious affairs had the very best of attention. These collegiate institutions were not at all uncommon in England, and in wealth, number of clergy, dignity of worship they may be said to have occupied a second or middle rank between the ordinary parochial churches on the one hand and the cathedral churches on the other.

In the great majority of cases the interior decoration of the chantry chapel was meagre, the donors seeming to have been able only to supply them with the bare necessities—with a vestment, a missal, cruets, bell, chalice, a paten and linens. At the same time there also existed a large number of noble specimens of architectural design. In such the stained glass window behind the altar was of exquisite workmanship, setting forth in brilliant and beautifully harmonized colors some subject of popular devotion or, in case of a guild chapel, the figure of the saint under whose patronage the association was founded. The altar, made of stone, was artistically carved, so as to set forth the different mysteries of the faith. Resting on it was a tablet bearing in large characters the name of the founder that all the worshippers might remember him in their prayers. Beautiful frescoes or rare and costly tapestries covered the walls, while the wooden screens which separated the chapel from the body of the church were of exquisite design and perfect workmanship. The roof too received attention. As a rule it was divided into a series of panels, each panel bearing the motto or monogram of the founder surrounded by delicately executed foliage whose serrated edges appeared as if the breath of woods had blown through them. Thus did these chapels become a no slight means of teaching the unlettered the mysteries of the faith.

But the most remarkable thing about these beautiful gems of art is that, as in the case of the great cathedrals, churches and castles of the Middle Ages, the designers and workmen

are unknown. It seems hard to account for the fact that the beauty, genius and invention discovered in their structure and decoration should not have rescued the names of their builders from the oblivion in which they lie. But what Rogers says, in speaking of the Middle Age cathedral, may help us to understand this condition of affairs, for his remarks apply with equal truth to the chantries. "It seems," he says,¹⁰ "that skill in architecture and intimate acquaintance with all that was necessary, not only for the design of the structure but also for good workmanship and endurance, was so common an accomplishment that no one was at pains to proclaim his own reputation or to record the reputation of another." And occasionally, when by accident, the author of some rarely beautiful specimen is discovered, the world is astonished to learn that a work so excellent in design and so perfect in execution as to have been ascribed to some great master¹¹ is from the hand of a simple village workman (at times even the very donor himself)¹² "a youth to fortune and to fame unknown."

But as we look about us now and see only vestiges here and there of these many expressions of the ardent faith and munificent charity of that by-gone time we are very apt to consider all such lavish ornamentation and exquisite detail as a waste of time and labor and wealth. Let us not forget, however, that as a rule the more beautiful chantries were meant to be perpetual memorials. By this I do not wish to imply that only the artistically decorated chapels were destined by the donors to last forever. Many of the most meagerly furnished chantries were built with this intention. As regards their existence, indeed,

¹⁰ Rogers, R. E. T.: "Six Centuries of Work and Wages," London, 1890, p. 162.

¹¹ A remarkable series of paintings on the walls of the Lady Chapel at Winchester long thought to be the work of some unknown Italian artist of the school of Giotto has been found by Wm. J. Clarke, to have been executed by an English man named Baker. Gasquet, F. A.: "Eve of the Reformation," London, 1900, p. 11.

¹² The chantry of John Baret, in the Church of St. Mary's Bury St. Edmunds, still quite well preserved and forming a most interesting remnant of church decoration, was very probably the work of John Baret himself. Here is an extract from the will of John Bawde of Woolpett dated 1501 and found on p. 83 of "Wills and Inventories from the Registers of the Commissary of the Bury St. Edmunds," etc. (1370-1650) (Camden Society), London, 1850, by Samuel Tymms. "I wyll that the tabernacle of St. James, weche I did make in the north yle and the troues of the auter there by, be well and sufficiently peynted and a cloth bought to save the seyd tabernacle fro soyle; also the stoole weche I ded make, colooored and garnysched wt synnys of Seynt Jamys."

chantries were of two kinds, those meant to be perpetual and those which, according to the will of foundation, were meant only to last for a stated number of years. Most of those erected in perpetuity did in fact exist till the statute of suppression was passed, although some of them, either because of insufficiency of revenue or because of the inability of one of the parties to carry out the conditions of the foundation, fell into decay, the altar being abandoned or sometimes even actually removed. Chantries to which this happened, as well as those which were explicitly founded for a certain number of years, greatly added to the number of what were called migratory priests—clerics who wandered about from place to place seeking fields of labor, thus becoming the source of most of the evils that can be placed at the door of the chantry system.

According to Canon Law chantries were of three kinds, mercenary, collative, and in private patronage. In the erection of the mercenary form the bishop played no part, the funds set aside by the donor never becoming ecclesiastical but always remaining in the hands of the founder or his trustees. By their institution no title was conferred. The priest was chosen by the owner to say mass and could be removed at the owner's will. Having no permanent endowment these priests were ordained by the bishop on proof that they were entitled to a small pension with which they declared themselves to be satisfied. History shows however that frequently they became dissatisfied and at times demanded for their services sums that were considered excessive. Chantries erected for a certain number of years and those depending for their maintenance on voluntary offerings of many persons were no doubt of this mercenary character. But this was by no means the more common form of foundation. The canon law of Rome as Maitland clearly proves was binding throughout England,¹³ and the unceasing effort of the canon law would be toward making all these foundations ecclesiastical. Besides as Moyes points out,¹⁴ we know from the use of the words "Post admis-

¹³ This Maitland does in his admirable series of essays entitled "Roman Canon Law in the Church of England," London, 1898. Cf. CATH. UNIV. BUL., 1901, Vol. VII, p. 347.

¹⁴ J. Moyes, in the "Academy," Vol. 37, p. 223.

sionem'' used in the constitution of Winchelsey and in the Gloss of Lyndwood, that the collative chantries or chantries by right of patronage were the common forms. In both of these forms the chantry was instituted by the bishops, the only difference being that in the latter form the right of presentation of the incumbent belonged to the founder or those named by him. It would seem however that of these two forms, chantries in private patronage was the more common, for it was the policy of chantry founders to keep to themselves or to their heirs the right of presenting the priest. But of course even in this case, in accordance with the canon law, which as we have said was recognized as of binding authority in England, institution by the bishop was necessary.

To erect these chantries conditions analogous to those required in the building of a church had to be fulfilled. Before everything else the permission of the ordinary was necessary, and this was given only when he was satisfied that funds sufficient for the erection and maintenance were laid aside. The bishop's consent obtained the founder then applied to the crown for license to alienate lands in mortmain. This license was not to be obtained without very special royal permission unless the lands were held by other than soccage tenure, or knight's service. But besides the permission of the bishop and the license of the crown it appears that the permission of the rector of the parish in which the chantry was to be raised had also to be obtained. At any rate it is certain that every possible care was taken that the vested rights of the mother church should not be allowed to be invaded.¹⁵ In a number of instances indeed the incumbent as an evidence of his subjection had to make an oath of obedience to the rector. By law he had to go with those who had permission to attend the services of his chantry, to take part in certain processions and ceremonies held during the year in the parochial church, a regulation, be it observed, which at times was neglected. Again, the chantry priest could receive no tithes or Easter dues; nor could he, without special permission of the ordinary, administer the sacra-

¹⁵ *Capellæ cum fuerint constructæ nihil in eis fiat quod in matricis ecclesiæ cedat præjudicium . . . statuimus ut sacerdotes in dictis capellis ministrantes universas oblationes quas in ipsis offerri contigerit, ecclesiæ matricis rectori cum integritate restituant.* Wilkins, "Concilia," Vol. II, p. 137.

ments or perform any other of the duties usually belonging to a priest with a cure of souls.¹⁶ From this it will be seen that the incumbents of the collative chantries or chantries in private patronage had only simple benefices; though at times as, for example, in cases of collegiate bodies and many outlying districts, benefices with cures existed.

Once the rights of the parish priest were secured, there still remained, in a large number of cases at least, other formalities to be carried out in the erection of the chantry. There was the legal institution by the civil authorities of the place where the chantry was founded. "Compositions," *i. e.*, bonds or agreements establishing the various chantries with their particular rules were enrolled in the city books, and in Bristol we are told that "it hath been used on the iiii daie after Mighelmas, the newe maire to bet summen all the chauntry priests whose composicions are enrolled in the rede boke to com before the maire to the counter, their to take their othes truly to observe their seide composicions."¹⁷

These "composicions" or regulations were the work of the donor of the chantry and were contained in the deed of foundation. In framing them the founder was free to command those things which seemed good to him so that he should lay down nothing out of harmony with the conciliar and synodal decrees, relative to the duties of a priest, duties of a patron, the rights of the parish rector and the like. Regulations made contrary to such decrees, duties and rights were to be considered by the bishop when instituting the chantry as null and void. To see the wisdom of these precautions one has only to read the wills of the period, which are filled with the most curious stipulations in violation of the church law. But, once the regulations were properly drawn up and were accepted by the bishop, the will of the founder was strictly binding even to details.

As one reads these different regulations he is impressed with the great care manifested in regard even to minute particulars. Everything is considered and provided for—the

¹⁶ *Inhibemus etiam ne in capellis quæ proprios parochos non habent, parochianis matricis ecclesiæ, nec aliis quibuscunque sacramenta vel sacramentalia ministrantur, nisi aliquibus amplius fuit indultum.* Wilkins, "Concilia," Vol. II, p. 137.

¹⁷ Ashley, W. J.: "An Introduction to English Economic History and Theory," 2 vols., London, 1888-93; Vol. II, p. 42.

method to be followed in choosing the priest and in giving the oath of office, the number of incumbents, if more than one is to be chosen, his duties and place of living, the disposition of the stock and stores, living and dead, the amount to be given in doles, and in salary, the provision for the proper decoration and repair.¹⁸ It sometimes occurred however notwithstanding these carefully prepared regulations that the chantry revenue from one cause or other became insufficient. In such cases it was not unusual to unite two or even three foundations under one priest,¹⁹ or for some relative of the founder to come forward to make up the deficit. Especially is this last act true with regard to supplying the chantry chapel with bell, vestments and books, and many touching instances of the piety and affection of the people of the times manifested in this way are seen in the wills of the fourteenth, fifteenth and early sixteenth century.

Let us now turn our attention to the chantry priest. In acquiring a knowledge of this life and character we shall

¹⁸ Here is a foundation charter for a chantry at the altar of St. Anne in the south arch of the church of Blessed Mary of Badsworth. It was founded in 1510 to pray for the soul of Isabella, wife of William Vavasour and daughter of Robert Urswick. The charter ordains that a chaplain of secular habit, not otherwise beneficed, should celebrate a requiem mass every week, and also a "Placebo" and "Dirige," according to the use in the cathedral church at York, he should turn to the people at the first (sic) lavatory in every mass and say "De Profundis" exhorting the people standing round to pray for the soul of the founder, and he should then say the collect (sic) "Incline Domine auram tuam ad preces nostras, etc.," for the same souls. And every year there should be an anniversary for the same Isabelle, on Tuesday after the octave of Easter, when there should be distributed to the poor of Badsworth, 6s. 8d., under the *superintendence of the rector*. The chaplain was to be learned in plain song and grammar and should be present in the choir of the parish church on every Sunday and festival at matins, mass, vespers, complin, and other divine services in his surplice; and was to read or sing as the rector should deem fit. He should not be absent from the said church for more than a month at a time, and then not without the licence of the rector. He should not play at dice and other illicit games, except on the 12 days after Christmas, and should not frequent the tavern or ale houses at unseemly times, *i. e.*, in the summer time, from the feast of the Annunciation to the Nativity of the B. V. M. after the hour of ten p. m., and in the winter time, from the Nativity of the B. V. M. to the Annunciation after 9 p. m. He was not to alienate the goods, books, jewels and ornaments of said chantry. If he should be convicted of incontinence, theft, rape, perjury, or other crime, or if he should be prevented by loss of any limb from performing his duties he should be removed by the rector. Quoted by Page in Yorkshire chantries from Duchy of Lancaster Records, Div. XI, vol. 25, p. 1.—Moyes in *Dublin Review* for January and April, 1899, in an article entitled "A Chantry Foundation" gives at length the charter of the foundation of the collegiate chantry of Robert Lord Bouchier (the first English lay Chancellor) at Halstead. It is dated November 12, 1411. Therein are given minute details, especially financial details. But its length forbids quotation here.

¹⁹ At St. Paul's London, for example 54 chantries had by union been reduced to 37 at the time of the suppression.

at the same time be obtaining a view of the evil effects of the chantry system in society, for the one is intimately bound up with the other. The good effects we shall reserve for a special paragraph.

The duties of the chantry priest varied as I have stated above according to the will of the founder. One duty only was essential—the saying or singing of mass daily for the soul of the donor or for the souls of the persons named by him. But in addition to this office, by the will of the founder, many chantry priests acted the part of curates, others assumed the office of school master or librarian, while a great number, located in cathedrals, collegiate houses and large parish churches, followed the duties of the choir. And this last office, when rightly performed, was no light labor. It began at dawn with the solemn recitation of Matins and Lauds, followed, at short intervals, by Little Hours and High Mass. In this way most of the morning was taken up while part of the afternoon was occupied in the singing of vespers and complin.

But after eliminating the number of chantry priests occupied in these various ways there still remained some priests, just what proportion to the whole body it is impossible to say, who had no other duty aside from the morning Mass. This office accomplished, and, though slight, some did not hesitate to neglect it, the rest of the day was theirs to do with as they pleased. There can be no doubt that some of this class, with perhaps a number of those who performed additional duties, spent it and some of the nights too, in the taverns and in doings little in harmony with their priestly office. Evidence of this is had in the wills,²⁰ in the records and memorials of episcopal visitations,²¹ and in the writings of men contemporary or almost contemporary with the existence of the chantry institution.²²

But this evidence is by no means as damning as some would have us believe. No doubt it shows that *some* chantry

²⁰ See Sharp's collections, also those of Raine, Furnival and Thymm.

²¹ See "Visitations and Memorials of Southwell Minster" (Camden Society), London, 1891, by Arthur Leach.

²² Stow's "Chronicle" (passim), where many curious incidents are related; also St. Germain, "Salem and Bizance," wherein we see the author urging the adoption of stringent measures to prevent them from "frequenting the ale house, or tavern," etc.

priests were totally unworthy of their calling but, as St. Cyprian said of the confessors of old, "we must not allow the wicked and evil characters of the few to tarnish the honorable glories of the many"; for there can be no doubt that the preponderating majority of the chantry priests were good men, men whose noble lives of devotion and self sacrifice are recorded only in the book of time.

According to such an eminent authority as Page, indeed, the chantry priests were "quite uniformly of good behavior."²³ This testimony is concurred in by Brewer, than whom, few men, if any, are more fitted to speak on this period of English history,²⁴ and is also well borne out by a study of the certificates of Edward the Sixth's commissioners. Besides, we must remember that the chantry priests had every reason to preserve a good character, since in case of misbehaviour they were removable. And finally, the fact that throughout the whole pre-Reformation period men of broad learning and noble principles, men high in the offices of the Church and State, the people at large (for, as Stubbs remarks, to say that they were unpopular is without foundation²⁵), and even the chantry priests themselves, when they were able, were engaged in making provision for this form of foundation—this fact I say of itself is of sufficient force to permit us to conclude that, as a class, the chantry priests were a respectable body of the clerical order.

To understand the existence of some bad chantry priests we need only to look at the cantarist's origin, education and home life. The chantry priests, like the other members of the clergy, were drawn from all ranks of society. No doubt those coming from the peasant class made up the main body, but those sprung from the more gentle folk were by no means rare. Indeed the wills of the period show that a very large proportion of those families who were in such circumstances as made it necessary for them to make a will had members or near kinsmen chantry priests.

²³ In introduction to the publication of "Yorkshire Chantry Records."

²⁴ Life of Henry VIII, Vol. II, p. 50. Quoted by Gasquet, "Eve of Reformation," p. 147.

²⁵ "Constitutional History of England," Oxford, 1887-1891, Vol. III, p. 380.

The amount of education possessed by these priests differed naturally according to their early opportunities. Most of those of good birth received their training in the best schools of the period—an education now recognized as broad and liberal; while there are not a few instances of chantry priests holding university degrees. But it cannot be said that, as a whole, the chantry priests were a well educated body of men. According to canon law it is true the cantarist like all other priests had to be able to read and write, to have a familiarity with the rules of grammar and with the ritual, and to possess a knowledge of the New Testament. But at times it happened, in admitting the candidate to orders, that some of those requirements were passed over. This sad state of affairs, if not begun, was at least greatly increased by the Black Death when, to secure the most necessary public religious ministrations, the most inadequately prepared subjects had to be accepted; and even those could be obtained only in insufficient numbers.²⁶ Thenceforward it was hard to check the evil. For with the increase of the wealth of the population “every mean man felt he must have a priest in his house to wait upon his wife.” As a result great numbers animated primarily, and at times solely by the motive of securing an easy means of livelihood, entered the ranks of the priesthood as cantarists. Large numbers of them traveled from town to town seeking employment in the chantries precariously endowed. And it was this pitiful condition of affairs which caused More to cry out, “The whole order is rebuked by the priest’s begging and lewd living, who are obliged to walk as rovers and live upon trentals or worse, or serve in a secular man’s house.”

The home life of the chantry priest was, in some instances, quite comfortable, some of them being provided with an appropriate house and garden, situated hard by the chantry chapel, while others were well housed as members of collegiate bodies. Some again had a home with the family of the benefactor. This last arrangement, however, tended greatly to bring the priesthood into contempt from the fact that often the cantarist was sent “to lie among the lay servants where he could neither use

²⁶ Consult Gasquet’s excellent chapter on “Some Consequences of the Great Mortality” in his work, “The Great Pestilence,” London, 1893.

prayer nor contemplation." Still other chantry priests boarded with families of the town. But this too was the source of many evils; for by it, says an ancient writer, "divine service in the church is minished, occasions of insolence are given, popular obloquy is engendered and scandals and dangers to souls arise."²⁷ And it is to one of these, no doubt, that Chaucer refers in his Shipman's Tale, when he writes:

"In London was a priest, an annuller,
That therein dwelled hadde many a year,
Which was so pleasant and so serviceable
Unto the wife theeras he was at table,
That she would suffer him no thing to pay
For board ne lodging, went he never so gay
And spending silver had he ryht ynoil [enough]."

But for the most part the chantry priest's home life was most wretched. Two small rooms of a low timbered hut usually served as a domicile. Its rudely built walls, matted or plastered with clay or mud, were frequently without windows. A hole in the roof admitted a feeble light and served also as a chimney.²⁸ For fireplace there was marked off a space in the ground in which was burned some dry turf or, at Christmas time, a yule log. A bench, a stool, a wooden bedstead and a mattress of straw comprised the furniture and household comforts. And such was the place in which, cooking his own frugal meal, many a chantry priest, poor without professing poverty, led his half monastic life, till at a ripe age, mourned by the poor people of the village or town, clothed in the priestly habit of coarse woolen stuff in which he had worked and prayed, he was placed in a rough rectangular coffin and laid to his eternal rest.

As I have intimated the chantry priest was, as a rule, poor, his usual annual revenue being five pounds—a sum scarcely large enough to supply him with the bare necessities of life.²⁹

²⁷ Quoted by Leach, p. xi of introduction to "Visitations and Memorials." See also Stow's Survey (*passim*) for curious and humiliating instances.

²⁸ For a description of a typical medieval house of peasant class see Fr. Johnston's article in CATH. UNIV. BULL. for July, 1898.

²⁹ The equivalent in our money for a pound of these days has been variously estimated. But we may safely say that a pound of the fifteenth century was worth at least eight or nine pounds of the present time.

Some indeed, to eke out a scanty living, were compelled, owing to their penury, to cultivate bits of glebe; others were able to add to their income by acting in the capacity of schoolmasters or librarians, while it is on record that some few took to stealing. In times when priests were comparatively few, however, the cantarists were not slow to take advantage of the pressing need of their services and demanded and received for their labors six, seven and even as high as ten pounds. But this was an abnormal state of affairs and we find the bishops taking stringent and successful measures to put a stop to it. Hence we may reasonably conclude that, after the close of the fourteenth century at any rate, notwithstanding the fact that the system of appropriation had lessened greatly the income of many of the parish clergy, there would be little incentive for a parish priest to leave

“his sheep accombred in the mire,
And run unto London unto Seinte Poules
To seeken him a chantry for souls—;

though before that period the lamentable practice was no doubt frequently indulged in. In such circumstances then, with many sprung from the lower class of society, without education, without a decent home or suitable revenue, in an age when the spirit of the priesthood in general had cooled, it is not surprising that a number of chantry priests, with plenty of time on their hands, should pass their lives in little harmony with the lofty ideals of their holy calling. Rather are we to be astonished that the body as a whole preserved a character of true priestly virtue.

The evils indulged in by some of the chantry priests and the important part which the devotion to the holy souls played in the foundation have caused most men to overlook the beneficent influence of the chantry system. This influence was, however, many-sided and lasting. In the first part of this paper when speaking of the different motives which moved men to build chantries I intimated the character of the good contemplated by the founders. It now only remains therefore for me to speak a little more in detail of what was actually accomplished.

It must be said, first of all, that the chantries were a great factor in the medieval scheme of relieving the poor—a work which the people of those days looked upon as a fundamental religious duty.³⁰ The wills of the period show that in nearly every case where a chantry was founded some provision for this purpose was made. We see, for example, that, as a rule, on the day of the donor's funeral, in the case of an individual foundation, or, if the chantry was the work of a guild, on the feast day of the saint in whose honor it was erected, alms were distributed—"a penny to each of a hundred men, three pence to three hundred, and food and drink enow." True this chantry alms giving, like much of the charity of the middle ages was, in general, indiscriminate, and yet there are many touching instances of benefactors taking care in the deed of foundation to direct their charity in special channels where it would do the most good, such as supplying of coal to the poorest among the families of the village, the maintenance of a bed in the village hospital and the like.³¹ And though, according to the ideas of modern philanthropy, there may have been many evils connected with the chantry method of relieving the poor, yet it cannot be denied that it was incomparably better than no giving at all, and the best the times could possibly offer. That it accomplished real good is evident from the terrible evils which followed the abolition of the system—evils due in a great measure to this very change.³² And that it cannot have been so utterly defective may be seen from a comparison with the results of the methods pursued in our own day. For with all our system and vast expenditure our alms giving is still quite indiscriminate and our abject poverty is greater.³³

But if the benefit attending the eleemosynary work of the chantry was great, the influence the system had on the religious condition of the country was even more significant. The Black

³⁰ See Stubbs, "Const. Hist.," Vol. III, p. 619-620.

³¹ *E. g.*, in the will of Percy Vale dated London, February 21, 1502, "To Master and Wardens of Merchant Tailors . . . 12 messauges . . . for maintenance of 2 chantry priests. The masters and wardens to spend annually the sum of 30 shillings, on the purchase of coals for poor parishioners of the parish of St. Mary, aforesaid.

³² So say Gibbins, Rogers, Cunningham and other writers of economic history. *E. g.*, see Rogers, pp. 418 seq., "Work and Wages." See Stubbs, III, "Constitutional History," p. 620.

³³ See Gibbins, "Industry in England," London, 1896, p. 195 et passim.

Death had stalked abroad over the whole island. In round numbers some 25,000 members of the clergy had fallen victims to its awful ravages.³⁴ As a result "there was everywhere" writes the chronicler Knighton "such a dearth of priests that many churches were left without the divine offices, mass, matins, vespers, sacraments and sacramentals." In this lamentable state of affairs the chantry foundation came as an invaluable means of supplying the religious needs of a prostrated people. But the usefulness of the chantry in parochial work was by no means confined to times of special needs. Throughout the period of his existence the chantry priest acted in much the same capacity as that now occupied by the curate, saying the morrow mass,³⁵ visiting the poor and "holding up the crucifix before the eyes of the dying."³⁶

But by far the most beneficent effects of the chantry system was its influence on the development of English education. Until within a comparatively short time this most useful work of the chantry, a work which our own age looks upon as god-like in character, was but little considered. Even Stubbs whose great book, "The Constitutional History of England," Maitland calls a training in justice,³⁷ gives it but scant attention, while he lays stress on the work of the noble statesman, "who after the dissolution of the monasteries, obtained in the foundation of grammar schools a permanent, free, and to some extent, independent source of liberal education for the people."³⁸ But recent investigation has clearly evidenced that before Edward the Sixth, before Henry the Eighth, before even the first rumblings of that upheaval which men have supposed brought light and liberty to a benighted and priest-ridden

³⁴ See Gasquet, "The Great Pestilence," pp. 203-204 seq.

³⁵ By the Morrow Mass is meant the mass said every morning "before sunrise, for such as be travellers by the way." Extract from a chantry certificate.

³⁶ Hundreds of examples of this might be taken from the volumes of surveys. As a sample I shall cite one, that of St. Katharine in the parish church of Selby: "The necessity thereof is to do divine service, and help the parish priest in time of necessity, to administer sacraments and sacramentals and other divine service. . . ." For "the said parish of Selby is a great parish, having but one curate, and the same parish is a thousand housling people; and the said curate has no help in time of necessity but only the said chauntry priest." "Yorkshire Chantry Surveys" (Surtees Soc.), p. 213.

³⁷ Maitland in *Eng. Hist. Rev.* for July, 1901. Article entitled "William Stubbs, Bishop of Oxford."

³⁸ "Constitutional Hist.," Vol. III, p. 627.

population, grammar schools were a common institution in England. It is now admitted, indeed, by men whose word no one can gainsay that England was far better provided with grammar-schools before the Reformation than it has ever been since.³⁹ And one of these men, Mr. Leach, than whom no one is better fitted to speak, does not hesitate to call the much lauded Edward VI, so long hailed on all sides as the great patron of education, "the spoiler of grammar schools."⁴⁰ All Edward, or Elizabeth, or the statesmen under them did was to restore in part,⁴¹ with scanty resources and more restricted aims, the grammar schools which had flourished under the form of chantries. And it is now quite certain that between the year 1547, the date of the chantry suppression act, and the year 1645, the date of the death of James I, no grammar school was founded which had not already existed as a chantry.⁴²

Just when the chantries came to be used as grammar schools is hard to determine. All we know at present is that when the monasteries, which had supplied the learning of the early middle ages, lost their influence over the minds and hearts of the people at large, the chantries seem to have gradually assumed the educational character, and this they retained, notwithstanding many obstacles, till they were suppressed by law. But unlike the monasteries, which seem to have been frequented more by the country gentlemen and the rich, the chantry schools were patronized more by the middle and lower classes. The reason for their popularity is quite obvious. They were free schools. In them the "ignoble and degenerate offspring" of the humblest peasant was enabled without expense to acquire that preparatory training necessary to fit him for the University. And in these latter institutions there were offered, says Stubbs, abundant facilities and fairly liberal inducements to scholars. Nor were the poor slow to see the great advantages. For in 1406 we find them petitioning "that every man

³⁹ Rashdall, *Harrow School*, Ch. II, p. 12. See article in *Dublin Review* for April, 1899, on "Medieval Grammar Schools," by J. B. Milburn.

⁴⁰ *Contemporary Review* for 1892, Vol. 62, p. 393. Cf. also Dr. Shahan's article in *Catholic Times* for December, 1894.

⁴¹ Edward the Sixth restored about one third.

⁴² Leach, *ubi supra*.

or woman of whatever state or condition he shall be, shall be free to set their son or daughter to take learning at any school that pleaseth them within the realm."⁴³ By the granting of this petition by Henry IV, and that at "a time when the supply of labor ran so low that no man who was not worth twenty shillings a year in land or rent was allowed to apprentice his child to a craft," the path which led to the highest positions in the Church and State was opened to the poor, and a high grade of learning was assured on all sides. Thus their existence is of itself a conclusive argument against the time-worn assertions of the dense ignorance of the period.⁴⁴

The instruction received in these chantries was by no means of an elementary character. True, the course of studies pursued was not so varied as that which obtains in the grammar school of the present day. But we cannot say they were much the worse off for that reason. The principal subject was Latin, for without a knowledge of that language it was impossible in those days to pursue a course in the universities or to make any progress in the learned professions. The grammar taught was that of Donatus, tutor of St. Jerome. But the word grammar had not then the restricted meaning given to it in the present day. It then stood for scholarship—"an acquaintance with Latin literature derived from a reading of the classical authors, and the power to speak as well as to write the language."⁴⁵ Among the authors studied were Terence, Cicero, Sallust, Cæsar, Virgil, Horace, Ovid, St. Augustine, St. Ambrose, St. Jerome, and Prudentius. But besides these works, writing, in Greek, Hebrew and French was also taught, and that not in a perfunctory manner but so thoroughly as to render them the medium of conversation during recreation. The method followed in the teaching of these matters did not greatly differ from that now pursued in our schools, excepting in so far as the

⁴³ "Rotuli Parl.," III, 602. Stat., II, 158, quoted in Stubbs, "Const. Hist.," Vol. III, p. 627.

⁴⁴ The Paston Letters show that "not only that family but also friends and neighbors, lords, commoners and domestic servants possessed the art of writing, and that no one of any rank or station in society was quite illiterate." And a recent writer has said that education in pre-Reformation England was less restricted than it has been from that time till within a quarter of a century.

⁴⁵ J. B. Milburn, *Dublin Review*, July, October, 1899, p. 167.

deep religious spirit which then presided over all is now sadly lacking.⁴⁶

It is as yet impossible to state precisely the number of chantries supporting these grammar schools. But already thanks to the publications of the English government and of different historical societies we are able to arrive at an estimate which cannot be far from the exact figure. The wills of the period show that in a comparatively large number of instances it is expressly stated that schools shall be maintained in connection with the chantries, whereas, by the returns of the commissioners of Edward the Sixth, we know that there were a great number of instances in which grammar schools, though not explicitly specified in the will, were in fact, supported by the foundation.⁴⁷ This was done sometimes in accordance with the wish of the governing bodies, sometimes by long custom and sometimes because the priest found profit in thus supplying a demand. Now calculations based on a study of the wills and on the commissioners' returns show, I think, that ten per cent. of the whole number of chantries founded were educational; or in round numbers that in England "when the floods of the great revolt called the Reformation were let loose" there were more than 300 chantry grammar schools.

We have no definite means of determining the exact number of pupils attending these schools, but no doubt it must have been very large. For while it is true that those attending them who could afford to pay were expected to do so, yet it must be remembered that these schools were really free schools, "teaching gratis the poor who ask it humbly for the love of God." Hence we are not surprised to find that they were attended not

"I cite the following beautiful prayer which the pupil of a Scottish Burg School recited every morning. That offered up by a student of a chantry school could not have greatly differed.

"I thank Thee, heavenly Father, that Thou hast willed that the past night has been prosperous for me; and I pray that Thou wilt also be favorable to me this day, for Thy glory and the health of my soul; and Thou who art the true light, knowing no setting, sun eternal, enlivening, supporting, gladdening all things, deign to enlighten my mind, that I may never fall into sin, but by Thy guiding arrive at life eternal. Amen. Jesus, be Thou Jesus to me; and by Thy chief spirit strengthen me—et spiritu principali confirma me." Grant, "Burg Schools," p. 60.

⁴⁷ In Lincolnshire out of ninety foundations (the place was only sparsely inhabited and the population was poor) nine were by deed of foundation grammar schools. "Chetham Society Publications."

only by the children of the neighborhood but also by those whose homes were at some distance. These last boarded with families living in the vicinity of the chantry, frequently on the proceeds of a fund specially set apart for the purpose by the generous chantry founder; or they were cared for in hospitals founded for that purpose in connection with the chantries. For the hospital of the middle ages was more often a house for the poor than a hospital for the sick.

Many of the eminent men of the later middle ages received their early education at these chantry schools, and not a few even began their career of greatness in the humble capacity of chantry priests. These were not forgetful of the benefits of the chantry institutions, and in after life we find some of them in grateful memory rearing free colleges that larger numbers might be able to enjoy their own early opportunities.

It may appear a long step from the simple but useful chantry to the college, *e. g.*, the magnificent establishments of Eton and Winchester. But these colleges were really chantries or collegiate churches of a larger type and the powerful influence for good which they have wielded in their long life through the centuries is owing to the chantry institution.

But the great good which these chantries had been doing and were still able to do did not shield them from the unholy designs of those who coveted the riches with which they were endowed. The great wealth to be derived from their plunder brought their suppression into consideration at the time when the court was discussing the dissolution of the monasteries. As early as 1529 we find an act passed forbidding any religious person, regular or secular, to receive a stipend or salary for the singing of masses for the dead. Again in 1536 Cranmer, in a sermon at St. Paul's, expressed as the King's desire, that the chantry should be destroyed. But these early threatenings seem to have been without immediate effect, since we find that the establishment of new foundations still continued without interruption for many years. But that these menaces were not idle is seen from Henry's action in November, 1545. In that year, the thirty-seventh of his reign, under the plea that the revenues of the chantries would enable him to defray the ex-

penses of his wars with France and Scotland, and at the same time lighten the heavy tax burden of the people, he caused his parliament to place at his disposition all chantries, colleges, free chapels and hospitals throughout the realm.⁴⁸ But this act, while it was of such a general nature as to include even the great universities,⁴⁹ did not vest the chantry properties immediately in the crown. It merely empowered Henry to appoint commissioners to carry it into effect; and until the work of the commissioners would be completed the original owners could not legally be disturbed.⁵⁰

In accordance with this act therefore, for which the generous parliament received the heartfelt thanks of the most gracious sovereign, men were appointed to enter in possession of such chantries, colleges and other foundations as should be named in their commissions. But it so happened that at the death of Henry, only a few of these commissions had been executed. In consequence the appropriation of the chantry lands, for the time at least, was not carried out, and before Edward, Henry's boy successor, could proceed to take possession of them, a new law giving him power to that effect was necessary.

Such a law, however, was not long in forthcoming. The rich booty to be derived from the suppression was never for a moment lost sight of by the greedy courtiers. Accordingly, on December 6, 1547, a new law was introduced in Parliament. By it, chantries, colleges, free chapels, etc., not actually seized during the late reign were declared the possession and seisin of the king and his successors forever.⁵¹ The passage of the bill was strenuously resisted. But the greed of the unscrupulous men who surrounded Edward won the day. First the Lords, and shortly afterwards the Commons, gave consent. The crown thus became possessor of the lands, goods, rents, and tenements of nearly 3,000 foundations. No pressing state need

⁴⁸ Stat. 37, Henry VIII, ch. 4.

⁴⁹ The Universities of Oxford and Cambridge with the colleges of Winchester and Eton were included, and in the breaking up of Parliament, notice was sent to both the universities, and colleges that they were at the King's disposal. This put them to petitioning for mercy which was soon obtained and letters of thanks were sent for the continuance of them.

⁵⁰ Dodd's "Church History of England," etc., by Rev. M. A. Tierney, London, 1839, Vol. II, p. 13.

⁵¹ Stat. I, Ed. VI, ch. 14.

was assigned for the passage of this nefarious measure and the promise of devoting the proceeds to the maintenance of grammar schools, to the competent endowment of the vicarages and to the establishment of larger parishes, was not fulfilled. The real end of the measure, as Milman points out, "was to satisfy the unprincipled and rapacious members of the council and their adherents."

In the beginning of March, 1548, commissioners were dispatched throughout all the shires of the country to make a survey of the chantries and other institutions which had been placed in the hands of the king. And thereupon followed a spoliation in comparison with which the recent lootings in China and the Philippine Islands are but as the shadow to the substance. "The halls of country houses were hung with altar cloths; tables and beds were quilted with copes; the knights and squires drank their claret out of chalices and watered their horses in marble coffins." It was, indeed, says Peter Heylin, "a sorry house and not worth the naming which had not somewhat of this furniture in it though it were only a fair large cushion, made of a cope, or altar cloth, to adorn the windows or make the chairs appear to have somewhat in them of a chair of state."

But aside from the cruel and blasphemous desecration of sacred vessels—objects dearer to the hearts of the people than words can tell, as being consecrated to all that was sweetest and most beautiful and most hopeful in their lives, aside, too, from the unjust and violent methods used in the prosecution of this spoliation, the suppression of the chantries had other evil effects of a more social character. By it a deep and lasting wound was inflicted on the whole structure of English society. It swept away the very basis of practically the whole of the secondary education. True, the system of instruction had received a serious blow in the destruction of the monasteries. But in the spoliation of the chantries the effect was more deadly. For the monasteries had been the schools mainly of the richer classes who one way or another might be able to supply, in some measure, the loss, whereas the chantry schools were the source of learning for the peasantry, the country's pride, who,

by their destruction, had no alternative but to lapse into a state of ignorance with all its attendant evils.

Here and there, it is true, some foundations previously provided for by pious endowment were continued under new and more limited ordinances. At a later period, when the cry of ignorance was heard all over the land, dilapidated remains of a few others were reconstructed and made fit for use, but at best these efforts only partially satisfied the crying need created by the maelstrom of fanaticism and greed.

Education, however, was not the only thing to suffer by the demolition of the chantries. Art too felt the baneful effects of the blow. The English people were unable to shake off the feeling of depression which came over them as they saw their treasures—those beautiful works in gold and silver and stone, those stained glass windows and beautiful vestments—all caught up in one fell swoop and deposited in the homes of the rich all over the land. A dull despair of ever replacing what had been so ruthlessly destroyed took possession of them. "Art died out in the land and King Whitewash and Queen Ugliness reigned supreme for centuries."⁵²

The chantry suppression act sounded the death knell of the English guild system. Never after did these great benefit societies of the middle ages take any active part in the public life—a part which in the care for the sick, the help of the poor and the development of the free and noble social life of the English, was of priceless value. The guilds were ruined. For even if it were true, as Ashley affirms, that Edward VI did not intend to "abolish," or "dissolve" or "suppress" or "destroy" them, yet, in the practical working of the statute, that is just what happened.⁵³ The guilds of the middle ages, to use Ashley's own expression, were simply "coöperative chantries,"⁵⁴ primarily and principally religious institutions. Most of their wealth in lands and stocks was derived from and increased by donations inspired by motives, in those days, regarded as religious. Hence to take from

⁵² Jessop in *Nineteenth Century* for March, 1898. Parish Life in England before the Great Pillage.

⁵³ Ashley, "English Economic History," p. 154.

⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 138.

them their religious character was to deprive them of the very source of their existence and to leave only an empty and useless shell. The heart which sent the bright blood of life through them and gave them the power for the great good they were accomplishing was thus ruthlessly ripped out and trampled on. Nothing was left to them but to die a speedy death. And so it came to pass; for from that moment the companies fell away in power as they fell away in faith.

Besides we are not so sure that the destruction of the guilds was not really the intention of the king. It is not so certain as Ashley asserts, that of the guild revenues only those devoted to religious purposes were confiscated.⁵⁵ Original documents in the Record Office prove that revenues devoted to ends which do not come under the head of what Ashley considers religious purposes were the object of the greedy clutch of the spoilers, and this too with the consent of the king. For in the reports of the commissioners sent to inquire into the possession of the guilds a black pen stroke is drawn through every recommendation to spare the corporate property which went for the maintenance of the poor. This was done by the crown official through whose hands the reports passed, intimating, says Gasquet, that the king, not recognizing any strict right on the part of the poor, would take possession of the entire property.⁵⁶

When we consider that few parishes throughout the realm were without guild lands,⁵⁷ donated by chantry founders for the support of the poor and aged, for the maintenance of hospitals,⁵⁸ for the building of roads, the repair of bridges, and the like, we may realize, to some degree at least, what a terrible effect this chantry act had on the condition of England at large. And while it cannot be denied that much of the woeful destitution of the sixteenth century was due to economic changes, to the succession of bad harvests from 1527 to 1536, to the agrarian revolution, and to the expansion of trade,⁵⁹ yet it is none the less certain that it is also due, in no

⁵⁵ Ashley, "English Economic History," p. 152.

⁵⁶ Gasquet, "Eve of Reformation," pp. 384-385, also introduction to Cobbett's "Reformation."

⁵⁷ Rogers, "Econ. Interpretation of History," London, 1888, p. 15.

⁵⁸ One hundred and ten hospitals mostly in form of chantries were destroyed.

⁵⁹ Rogers, "Econ. Int. of Hist.," p. 242, seq.

small measure, to the disestablishment of the chantries.⁶⁰ And though it may not be said absolutely, that the poor law was the direct result of the chantry suppression, yet it is undeniable that this measure left open a door for the introduction of that law.

With the great sufferings of the poor came also untold hardships to the priests themselves. For by this act thousands of them were suddenly deprived of their means of livelihood, and, without provision, were cruelly left to do as best they might. True, as was done in the case of the ejected monks some years before, a pension about equal to what they had received while acting in the capacity of chaplains was, by law, granted to them. But for various reasons, the payment of the pensions, in all but comparatively few cases, did not long continue. As a result hundreds of the chantry priests were soon reduced to the extremities of want. Besides they were ridiculed and publicly insulted in the streets, the boys "reveling, tossing of them, taking violently their caps and tippets from them."

Some writers have endeavored to show that this unholy suppression of the chantries was not at all unwelcome to the people at large. And in truth it cannot be denied that in the beginning there were some, not a few, who sympathized with the movement. No doubt too many of these were animated by the purest motives. They were daily witnesses of most shocking laxity in the lives of some chantry priests. They felt the need of reform. And that there was urgent need of reform should not surprise us. For we must recollect that the religious life is a spiritual life. Nature has to be held in constant check. From time to time all devoting themselves exclusively to religion need to be held up and to be made to begin afresh. If external helps be removed, then after a long period of freedom and owing to a variety of circumstances, the spiritual life grows weak. The Church teaching and church laws remain in force but they lose their power to exact obedience. Thus the wave of laxity moves along and grows in strength—soon sweeping over large bodies of the religious world. The people

⁶⁰ Gibbins, "Industry in England," p. 208.

at first seem not to note the degeneracy. But suddenly all awoken to the existence of this state of affairs. Some laugh sarcastically at it. Others try to hide it. Others again, and among them noble types of the priesthood, stand out and throw all their strength against it, while large numbers, crying out wildly and without waiting for the slow moving Church to act, take it upon themselves to bring about a reform. This happened with regard to the chantry priests. But it was not the first occurrence of the kind. The Wycliffite movement was of a similar nature. It was however the first time in England that such a movement had behind it the state power and a large body of nobles moved on by lust and avarice. Hence its success.

With this in mind then we are not surprised that many good souls should for a time look kindly on this agitation against the chantries believing that it was inspired by holy and unselfish motives. But they were soon undeceived, as Burnet himself is forced to admit, when they saw "the open lewdness in which many (of the destroyers) lived, without shame or remorse . . ." when they saw "the gross and insatiable scrambling after the goods and wealth . . ." when they saw the spoilers' "irregular and immoral lives."⁶¹

As for the main body of the people their opposition to the chantry destruction is undoubted. For notwithstanding the fact that the middle classes and the poor were absolutely in the power of the great who had been bribed and who, in turn, were themselves at the mercy of the king, the chantries were not dissolved without strong opposition. "In Yorkshire in 1548 the inhabitants of Leamer, near Scarborough, and the neighborhood, rose under the leadership of William Ambler of East Heselton yeoman, Thomas Dale parish clerk of Leamer, and one Steavenson, and in the night set the beacon alight at Staxton, collecting a company of about three thousand persons, who went to the house of Matthew White, one of the commissioners under the act of Edward the Sixth and particular receiver of chantry lands, and dragged him, one Clapton, his

⁶¹ Burnet, Gilbert: "History of Reformation of the Church of England," (edited by N. Pocock), 7 vols., London, 1865; Vol. III, pp. 216, 217.

wife's brother, one Savage, supposed to have been Richard Savage, Sheriff of York in 1540, and one Berry, servant to Sir Walter Mildmay, one of the commissioners for the sale of chantry lands, from their beds, and carried them to the wolds near Leamer, and there murdered them.'⁶² Nor were like insurrections confined to a few localities. They broke out in all parts of the country, the most dangerous being in Cornwall, Devonshire and Norfolk. But German and Italian mercenaries were introduced and the protests of the people choked in their own blood.

Nor again was the resistance to the spoliation of the chantries restricted to the common people. For, notwithstanding the fact that nobles were bought off by the chantry treasure, many stoutly resisted the iniquitous proceeding, declaring that the king had no right to seize property given by their forefathers for a specified object—an object too that the king had promised to protect. In some cases this opposition met with success. Chantry properties were allowed to be retained by their lawful owners, as was the case of the chantry of St. Anne, Askrigg. But such cases were very rare.

As to the chantry priests themselves we hear but very little protest from them. Though the people most concerned history says little about their manner of acting while the law was being carried into effect. Most of them no doubt were silenced by the promise of pensions. Besides they were almost universally very poor, and long distances separated one from another so that there could come from them no concerted action. But without doubt they took an active share in the numerous popular uprisings.

This brings our brief study of the chantry to a close. If successful it has served to bring out in consecutive narration what has been but briefly touched upon in a variety of documents and histories—the nature of the chantry, its appearance and its importance in pre-Reformation life, as seen from its actual accomplishment and from the evils consequent on its suppression.

CORNELIUS HOLLAND.

ST. JOSEPH'S CHURCH, PROVIDENCE, R. I.

⁶² From Wilson's "History of York," Vol. I, p. 132, quoted by Page in "Yorkshire Surveys," Vol. I, p. xvi.

BIBLIOGRAPHY.¹

SOURCES:

(a) *Documentary:*

- Bliss, W. H., and Johnson, C. Calendar of entries in papal registers relating to Great Britain and Ireland, 3d vol. (1342-1362). (Rolls Series), London, 1893-1897.
- Chaucer, Geoffrey. Complete works, ed. by W. W. Skeat, 7 vols., Oxford, 1894-97. (Canterbury Tales, Vol. IV.)
- Furnival, F. J. (editor). Fifty earliest English wills (The) in the Court of Probate, London (1387-1454). (Early English Text Society), London, 1852.
- Fowler, J. F. (editor). Acts of the chapter of the collegiate church of St. Peter and St. Wilfred, Ripon—(1452-1506). (Surtees Society), London, 1875.
- Leach, A. F. (editor). Visitations and Memorials of Southwell Minster. (Camden Society), London, 1891.
- Page, William (editor). Yorkshire Chantry Surveys—being the certificates of the commissioners appointed to survey the chantries, guilds, hospitals, etc., in the county of York. 2 vols. (Surtees Society), London (1898?).
- Ramsay, A. Paston Letters (abridged). 2 vols., London, 1840-41.
- Sharpe, R. R. Calendar of wills proved and enrolled in the court of husting, London, 1258-1688. 2 vols., London, 1889-1890.
- Tymms, Samuel. Wills and inventories from the registers of the Commissary of Bury St. Edmunds, and the Archdeacon of Sudbury (1370-1650). (Camden Society), London, 1850.
- Raines, F. R. (editor). A history of the chantries within the county Palatine of Lancaster—being the reports of the royal commissioners of Henry VIII, Edward VI, and Queen Mary. London.

(b) *Archæological, Historical, Antiquarian:*

- Leach, A. F. (editor). Early Yorkshire schools (Vol. I). York, Beverly, Ripon (Yorkshire Archeological Society), Record Series, Vol. XXVII, London, 1899.
- Pecock, Reginald. The Repressor of overmuch blaming of the clergy. Ed. by Churchill Bobington (Rolls Series), 2 vols., London, 1860.
- Raine, James (elder). History and Antiquities of North Durham. London, 1852.
- Raine, James (younger). Historians of Church of York and its Archbishops. (Rolls Series), 3 vols., London, 1879-94 (Vol. III).
- Stow, John. A Survey of the Cities of London and Westminster and of the Borough of Southwark. 2 vols., London, 1754-5.

¹ This list does not aim at being exhaustive.

SECONDARY COLLECTIONS:

(a) *Historical works of a general character with sections bearing more or less directly on the question of the chantries:*

- Burnett, Gilbert. History of the Reformation of the Church of England. (Ed. by N. Pocock), 7 vols., London, 1865.
- Capes, W. W. A History of the English church in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries. New York, 1900.
- Denton, William. England in the fifteenth century. London, 1888.
- Dodd's Church History of England with notes, etc., by Rev. M. A. Tierney, London, 1839.
- Fuller, Thomas. The Church History of Britain; from the birth of Jesus Christ until the year 1648.
- Green, J. R. History of the English people. 4 vols., London, 1877-80.
- Lingard, John. A History of England to 1688. 10 vols., London, 1883.
- Pearson, C. H. English in the fourteenth century. London, 1876.
- Trevelyan, G. M. England in the Age of Wycliffe. London, 1899.
- Waterworth, J. Six historical lectures on the origin and progress in England of the change of religion called the Reformation. Phil., 1842.

(b) *Historical works treating of special questions, and containing some references to chantries:*

- Chandler, William. Life of William Waynflete, Bishop of Winchester (with an appendix of records). London, 1811.
- Cobbett, William. A History of the Protestant Reformation in England and Ireland, with notes and preface by F. A. Gasquet, New York, 1896.
- Cutts, E. L. Parish priests and their people in the middle ages. London, 1898.
- Gasquet, Francis Aiden. The Great Pestilence, 1348-49. London, 1893.
- Gasquet, F. A. Henry VIII and the English monasteries. London, 1889.
- Gasquet, F. A. Eve of the Reformation. Studies in the religious life and thought of the English people in the period preceding the rejection of Roman jurisprudence by Henry VIII. New York, 1900.
- Grant, James. History of the Burg Schools of Scotland. London, 1876.
- Green, Mrs. J. R. Town life in the fifteenth century. 2 vols., London, 1893.
- Harris, Miss Darmer. Life in an old English town. London, 1898.
- Jessop, Augustus. The coming of the Friars and other essays. London, 1890.
- Lea, H. C. An historical sketch of sacerdotal celibacy in the Christian Church. Boston, 1884.
- Milman, H. H. Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral. London, 1869.
- Montalambert, Comte de. The Monks of the West (with introduction by F. A. Gasquet). London, 1896.
- Stubbs, Wm. The Constitutional History of England to 1485. 3 vols., Oxford. 1887-1891.

(c) *Economic, Historical:*

- Ashley, W. J. An introduction to English economic history and theory. 2 vols., London, 1888-93.

- Cunningham, Wm. The growth of English industry and commerce. 2 vols., Cambridge, 1890-92.
- Cunningham, Wm. An essay on Western civilization in its economic aspects. Vol. 2: Medieval and modern times. Cambridge, 1900.
- Gibbins, Henry de B. Industry in England. (Historical outlines), London, 1896.
- Levasseur, E. Histoire des classes ouvrières et l'industrie en France avant 1789. Paris, 1900.
- Maitland, Frederic William. Township and Borough. Cambridge, 1898.
- Rogers, J. E. T. A History of agriculture and prices in England, 1259-1793. 6 vols. (Vol. I), Oxford, 1866-1887.
- Rogers, J. E. T. Six centuries of work and wages: the history of English Labor. London, 1890.
- Rogers, J. E. T. The economic interpretation of history. London, 1888.

(d) *Canon Law:*

- Ferraris. Bibliotheca, etc. (Vol. II under C.) 9 vols., Rome, 1885-1899.
- Maitland, F. W. Roman Canon Law in the church of England: six essays (reprinted from the English Historical Review and the Law Quarterly Review). London, 1898 (first three essays).
- Thomassin, Louis. Ancienne et nouvelle discipline de l'église touchant les bénéfices et les bénéficiers. 3 vols., Paris, 1725.
- Van Espen, J. B. Jus Ecclesiasticum universum, etc. 5 vols., Lyons, 1727.
- Wilkins, David. Concilia Magnæ Britanniæ et Hiberniæ, A.D. 446-1718. 4 vols., London, 1737. (2 and 3 vols.)

(e) *Miscellaneous:*

- Church, Alfred J. The chantry priest of Barnet. (A Tale of the Two Roses.) London, 1885.
- Ducange. Glossarium et Scriptores mediæ et infimæ latinitatis. 6 vols., 1733, Paris. (Under words cantuaria et capellania.)
- La Grande Encyclopédie. Inventaire raisonné des sciences, des lettres et des arts. Lamirault et cie, Editeurs, Paris.
- Palgrave, R. H. Inglis (editor). Dictionary of Political Economy. 3 vols., London, 1894-1900.

Magazine articles:

- Academy, XXXVII, p. 223—Chantry priests, by J. Moyes.
- Archeological Journal (passim).
- British Archæological Association Journal, XX, p. 111 (1864). Wayside Chapels, by F. R. Wilson.
- Catholic Times, Philadelphia, for December 1, 1894, "Grammar Schools," by Dr. Shahan.
- Contemporary Review for 1892—Edward VI. Spoiler of Schools, by A. F. Leach.
- Dublin Review for October, 1894. Papal jurisdiction in Medieval England, by Mgr. Moyes.

- Dublin Review for January and April, 1899. A Chantry foundation, by Mgr. Moyes.
- Dublin Review, April, 1899. Medieval grammar schools, by J. B. Milburn.
- Irish Ecclesiastical Record, Vol. VIII, 1900. A Forgotten Chantry, by J. B. Cullen.
- London Quarterly, XXXII (1869). Annals of St. Paul's Cathedral, by H. H. Milman.
- Nineteenth Century, March, 1898, p. 433. Parish life in England before the great pillage, by A. Jessop.
- Nineteenth Century, October and November, 1899. Parish life in medieval England, by A. Jessop.
- Notes and Queries (passim).
- Revue Bénédictine, Vol. VII, 1890. Les offrandes.
- Revue Bénédictine, Vol. XV, 1898, Le IX centenaire de l'institution de la commémoration des défunts.
- Revue des Questions Historiques, for 1895, Vol. LVII. La société au commencement du XVI siècle, d'après les homélies de Josse Clichtoue, 1472-1543, by H. Chérot, S.J.
- Saturday Review, Vol. LIX, p. 344. Chantries.
- Tablet, September 25, 1880. Guilds of Catholic London.
- Tablet, July 30 and August 6, 1898. The first lay Lord Chancellor, by Mgr. Moyes.
- Tablet, September 3, 1898. Christian Democracy in Pre-Reformation times. (Paper read at Catholic Conference at Nottingham: Dom A. F. Gasquet.)
- University Bulletin (Catholic). Articles by Dr. Shahan and by Fr. Johnston.

Bibliographical:

- Gardiner, Samuel, and Mullinger, J. Bass. Introduction to the study of English History. Third edition. London, 1896.
- Gross, Charles. The sources and literature of English history from the earliest times to about 1485. London, 1900.

MARRIAGE OF NEAR KIN.

Kinship within certain limits is regarded by nearly all mankind as an impediment to marriage, though the degree of consanguinity constituting such a bar varies among different peoples. Almost universally the ties existing between parent and child and between brother and sister having the same father and mother are recognized as preventative of marital union. Yet even these bonds have not always availed as a hindrance to marriage. In his *Memorabilia* Xenophon represents the sophist Hippias as expressing to Socrates the opinion, that the law which forbade parents to intermarry with their children was not from the gods, for the reason that the speaker found some nations that transgressed it. Who these nations were, however, Hippias does not inform us.¹ The astronomer Ptolemy is more specific, for he states in his *Tetrabiblos* that, owing to the stellar influences under which they fall, most of the inhabitants of India, Ariana, Gedrosia, Parthia, Media, Persia, Babylon Mesopotamia and Assyria, have children by their own mothers,² and St. Jerome, writing against Jovian, says that "the Persians, Medes, Indians, and Ethiopians, marry their mothers, grandmothers, daughters and granddaughters."³

Whatever doubt may exist concerning the incestuous character of the alliances contracted by the other peoples whom Ptolemy and St. Jerome mention, the corresponding testimony of a number of authors compel us to believe that instances, more or less numerous, existed of intermarriage not only between brother and sister, but even between parent and offspring, among the Persians. Quintus Curtius tells us that a satrap of Naura at the coming of Alexander the Great, was the father of two sons by his own mother, "for," says the biographer, "in those regions it is allowed parents to form

¹ Xenophon, *Memorabilia*, Lib. IV, Chap. IV, 20.

² "The *Tetrabiblos* or *Quadripartite* of Ptolemy," trans. from the copy of Leo Allatius by James Wilson, Book, II, Chap. III, p. 67.

³ S. Hieron, *adv. Jov. Lib.*, II, C. 7. See Migne, P. L., tom. 23, p. 296. "Persæ, Medi, Indi et Ethiopes regna non modica et Romano regno paria cum matribus et aviis, cum filiabus et neptibus, copulantur."



shameful unions with their children.”⁴ Plutarch asserts that one of the beneficent results following upon the conquest of Alexander, was that the Persians were taught to venerate their mothers and not to possess them as wives.⁵ The same writer also informs us that the Persian King Artaxerxes married his two daughters, Amestris and Atossa,⁶ and Diogenes Laertius writes: “It is not unlawful for the Persians to wed their daughters, a thing which would be considered by the Greeks most wicked.”⁷ Again Athenæus relates that Antisthenes, in one of his treatises reproaches Alcibiades with having had illicit relations with his mother, as well as with a daughter and a sister, after the manner of the Persians.⁸ But needless to say, whatever evidence this notorious gossip may furnish is of little worth except as giving some cumulative value to the deposition of other witnesses more reliable.

To the list of those who charge the Persians with the practice of marrying their mothers, must be added the names of the author of the *Recognitions*, of Tertullian who relies on the questionable Ctesias, of Minutius Felix, St. Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, Theodoret and St. John Chrysostom.⁹ Finally, as late as the sixth century Agathias speaks of the Persians of his day as contracting alliances of this kind though these connections, he says, were at variance with the former manners of the country, their origin being attributable to the teaching of Zoroaster. The same historian tells us that Artaxerxes, the son of Darius, when his mother Parysatis besought him to marry her, refused to do so on the ample ground that such a union would be consonant “neither with religion nor with the laws of the country, nor with good morals.”¹⁰

⁴ Quintus Curtius Rufus; *De Reb. gest. Alex.*, Lib. VIII, C. II. “His in fidem acceptis, in regionem quam Naura appellant rex cum toto exercitu venit, satrapes Sysimithres duobus ex sua matre filiis genitis, quippe apud eos parentibus stupro coire cum liberis fas est.”

⁵ Plutarchi, *De Alex. Mag.*, *Fortuna aut Virtute Oratio prima*, V.

⁶ Plutarchi omnia quæ extant cum Lat. interpret Cruserii Xylandri, Vol. I, p. 1025.

⁷ Diogenis Laertii; *De Clar. Philosoph. vitis, etc.*: Pyrrho, Lib. IX, 83.

⁸ Athenæi *Dipnosophist. sive Cœnæ Sapient*, Lib. V, Cap. XIV.

⁹ Clemens Romanus *Recognition.* Lib. IX, Cap. XX, *Apolog.* C. IX. *Ad Nationes*, Lib. 1, C. XVI. *Octav.* C. XXXI. *Pædagog.* Lib. I, C. VII. *Contra Celsum*, Lib. V, C. XXVII; Lib. VI, C. LXXX. *Præpar. Evang.*, Lib. VI, 10. *Græc Affect Cur.*, *Serm.* IX, 935. *De Virgin.* VIII in *Epist* 11, *ad Cor. Homol.*, VII.

¹⁰ Agathia, *De. Imper. et Reb. gest Just. Vulcanius.* *Venitiis*, 1729, Lib. II, p. 44 E, et p. 51 A.

The contention of Agathias that this incestuous custom arose among the Persians from the influence of the religion of Zoroaster is worthy of note. That the tree of Zoroastrianism ever bore such fruit the Parsees, the modern disciples of Zoroaster, most stoutly deny. Certain it is the word *Khvetuk-das* current among the Parsees to-day to designate marriage of near kin does not connote a union of a closer consanguinity than the second degree. It is no less certain that the sense of this expression as it is found in the remnant of the Avesta that has come down to us—the sole document of an intrinsic authority representing the ancient discipline of Zoroaster—does not give warrant to the assertion of Agathias. According to West “the term *Khvetuk-das* ‘does not occur at all in the oldest part of the Avesta, and when it is mentioned in the latter portion it is noticed merely as a good work, which is highly meritorious without any allusion to its nature; only one passage (*Vend.*, VIII, 36) indicating that both men and women can participate in it.’”¹¹

But if the Avesta gave no literal sanction, as far as we can know, to marriage within the first degree of kindred, the better Pahlavi works contain many references to the holiness of such alliances and the duty of contracting them, and it is not unlikely that Agathias derived his appreciation of the influence of Zoroastrianism from some of these versions which, as we possess them at present, first appeared about his time.¹²

Another evidence of the attitude of the Avesta towards marital union with next of kin is supplied by those authors who impute the custom of marrying a mother, not to the Persian people at large, but to the hereditary sacerdotal caste—the Magi. As the Avesta was originally written for the Magi only, we would expect to find the doctrines inculcated by it finding first expression in the life of these priests. And that the members of this class took to wife their mothers, Xanthus, who it is said flourished shortly after the death of Cambyes, bears witness in a text preserved by St. Clement of Alexandria. The geographer Strabo and the apologist Tatian¹³ bear the same

¹¹ See E. W. West, *Pahlavi Texts*. In “*Sacred Books of the East*,” Vol. XVIII, p. 427.

¹² West, *loc. cit.*

¹³ *Stromat.*, Lib. III, C. 2. Strabo, Lib. XV, C. III, 20. Tatian, *Oratio ad Græcos*, C. 28.

testimony of the Magi, while Catullus is more particular still when he tells us that a Magus, according to the Persian religion, should be born of a marriage formed between mother and son.

Nam Magus ex matre et gnato gignatur oportet
Si vera est Persarum impia relligio.¹⁴

The religious ordinance here mentioned by Catullus was of the Magism, which, together with the Magi themselves, was introduced by Cyrus into Persia from the province of Media.¹⁵ Hence the declaration of Agathias that marriage with a mother was a departure from the former manners of the Persians, is seen not to offer the contradiction which Mr. Adam in his article in the *Fortnightly*¹⁶ thought it offered to the testimony of Xanthus who, in his early day, as already said, represents the Magi as having entered into this kind of unions. In view too of the fact that Magism in all its observances did not prevail throughout Iran until six centuries after the reign of Artaxerxes Longimanus, the language of Artaxerxes II describing the solicited marriage with his mother, as opposed to the dictates of religion, becomes clearly intelligible.

Restricted at first to the Magi, the practice of marrying a mother naturally enough in course of time would be taken up by the laity. At first this form of incest would seem to be confined, as a distinctive usage, to the more exclusive classes. And so we learn from Philo that the "magistrates of the Persians marry even their own mothers and consider the offspring of such marriages the most noble of all men."¹⁷ But such a badge of aristocracy would not be long exclusive. Hence it is we find so many writers attributing the custom of contracting these alliances to the nation generally.

The statements, however, regarding the extent of these marriages among the Persians, made by Greek writers or on the authority of such, cannot but be regarded with suspicion. The Greek historian and biographer were preposterously prejudiced against foreigners and their habitual proneness to color falsely and exaggerate whatever they might

¹⁴ Catull., Carm., XC, 3.

¹⁵ Xenophon, Cyrop., VIII, I, 23.

¹⁶ W. Adam, "Consanguinity in Marriage," *Fortnightly Review*, 1865, Vol. II.

¹⁷ Philonis Judæi De Special Leg., trans. by C. D. Yonge, Vol. III, p. 306.

find of ill-repute in other lands must be ever borne in mind when we read their reports of the incestuous connections of the Persians.

As the Persians had received the institution of Magism from the Medes so these in turn received it from Babylonia. The tradition therefore recorded by Said Ebu-Batrich, Patriarch of Alexandria (876-940), according to which the first Magus to take his mother to wife was the first also whom Nimrod, the founder of the Babylonish Empire, constituted minister of fire-worship, is not without some historic interest.¹⁸ The grandson of this Nimrod was Ninyas and he, the Spanish presbyter Orosius informs us, married his mother Semiramis,¹⁹ though, according to Agathias, this son murdered his mother that he might free himself from her importunate solicitations.²⁰

Herodotus tells us that not until Cambyzes espoused his sister Atossa was intermarriage of brother and sister known of in Persia.²¹ Before this time however, as Wilkinson clearly gathered from the sculptures found both in Upper and Lower Egypt, marriage with a sister took place among the Egyptians,²² and Diodorus says that common report had it that such alliances were ordained by law in this land.²³ Maspero is of opinion that the union of a father and daughter was perhaps not wholly forbidden among the ancient Egyptians,²⁴ but of this he adduces no substantial evidence.

¹⁸ Quoted in Selden *De Jure Naturali et Gentium*, Vol. 1, Tom. I, Lib. V, Cap. XI. "Dicitur enim is (Nimrod) primus qui ignem coluit. Scilicet cum videret flammæ e longinquo in oriente ascendentes e terra illac ut penitius eas contueretur descendit, atque eas adoravit. Illic vero hominem constituit qui sacra ministraret igni et in eum thura porrigeret. Atque ab eo tempore coeperunt magi ignem colere atque adorare eum. Nomen autem hominis quem Nimrod constituit sacrum ignis ministratorem erat Andshan, cui diabolus e medio ignis hisce usus est verbis Nemo hominum potis est rite igni ministrare nec mea sacra callere, nisi commisceatur cum matre sua, et sorore sua et filia sua. Fecit itaque Andshan juxta quod dixerat ei diabolus. Et ab eo tempore qui sacerdotio apud magos functi sunt, commisceri solebant cum matribus et sororibus suis et filiabus suis. Et Andshan hic primus erat, qui hunc morem incepit." Selden would lead us to think that the Patriarch of Alexandria based his story on data furnished by oriental monuments. Sayce, however, is authority for the statement that outside of the account of Gen. X no historic traces whatsoever can be found of Nimrod.

¹⁹ Orosii, "Adv. Pag Hist.," Lib. VII, lib. I, C. IV.

²⁰ Agathias, op. cit., Lib. II, p. 44, D.

²¹ Herod., Hist., Lib. III, 31.

²² Sir J. Gardner Wilkinson, "The Manners and Customs of the Ancient Egyptians," ed. by Samuel Birch, Vol. I, p. 319.

²³ Diodor., I, 27.

²⁴ G. Maspero, "The Dawn of Civilization in Egypt and Chaldaea," p. 50.

Whether or not the marriages spoken of by Diodorus and Wilkinson were with a full sister such as that of Cambyses, we do not know for certain, though that such they were we would infer from the well-known alliances of the Ptolemies who, without any sign to indicate that they had departed from the former practice of the Egyptians, took to wife their sisters german.

If we are to believe Garcilasso de la Vega, the Incas of Peru were wont to marry their sisters, for this chronicler narrates that Manco Ccapac, the first of the Peruvian kings, espoused his sister and his "legitimate and illegitimate sons also married their sisters to preserve and increase the descendants of the Incas."²⁵ But the account given by Garcilasso of the origin of his royal race, caught up, as he tells us, from the tales which he heard as a child from the elders of his people, possesses nothing beyond the value of interesting folk-lore. Moreover, Acosta positively asserts that marriages between brother and sister were always held as unlawful among the Incas, until in the sixteenth century Tapa Inqua Tupanqui married "Mamaoello his sister by the father's side, decreeing that the Inquas might marry with their sisters by the father's side and no other."²⁶

If the human race was to descend from a single pair, it was inevitable that the first son of this pair could only marry one born of the same parents as himself. And so the wife of Cain was his own sister. Upon the rapid multiplication of the species however, the partriarchs ceased to intermarry with their full sisters, and even as we would infer from the words of Abraham, Gen. XX, 12, with their uterine sister. Still they continued to form their marital alliances only within the circle of their near relations, Abraham telling the "elder servant of his house" to "go to my country and kindred and take a wife from thence for my son Isaac," and Isaac in turn charging his son to go "to the house of Bathuel, thy mother's father, and take thee a wife thence of the daughters of Laban, thy uncle." When Esau married two of the Hethite women he gave such

²⁵ Garcilasso de la Vega, first part of the "Royal Commentaries of the Yncas," trans. by C. R. Markham, Vol. I, p. 93.

²⁶ Joseph Acosta, "The Natural and Moral History of the East and West Indies," trans. by E. G., London, 1604, p. 470.

offense to his parents that to appease them he took to wife Maheleth, the daughter of Ismael, his uncle.²⁷

Of closer consanguinity was the marriage of Abraham with his half-sister, Sarah;²⁸ of Nachor with his niece Melsha,²⁹ and probably Amram with Jochabed, who in Ex. VI, 20, is said to be the aunt of her husband.³⁰ It is to be observed that the blood connection existing in the marriages just mentioned was upon the father's side only. And because such connection did not operate to prevent marriage in these instances anthropologists have maintained that the relationship here obtaining, through the male line, was unrecognized. But freedom to contract these alliances, as we shall see in a subsequent chapter, cannot be construed as a disregard of male kinship. Barring the possible case of Amram and Jocabed which is clearly exceptional, this freedom is to be referred to the familial conditions which obtained at the time.

The Hebrew legislation against marriage of near kindred is to be found in Lev. XVIII and XX and in Dent. XXVII.³¹ Of the thirteen verses (6-18) in Lev. XVIII that bear upon the degrees of relationship declared to be a bar to matrimonial union, there are six that refer to consanguinity.³² These pro-

²⁷ Gen. XXIV, 2, 4; XXVIII, 1, 2; XXVI, 34, 35; XXVIII, 8, 9.

²⁸ Gen. XX, 12. According to Josephus (*Ant.*, Lib. I, Cap. XII) Sarah was the niece, not the sister of Abraham. This interpretation St. Jerome is inclined to follow (*"De Perp. Virg. B. M."*, 15) though he admits that the more apparent sense of the text, is that Sarah was the sister; not the niece of Abraham. The reason prompting St. Jerome and St. Augustine (*cont. Faust.*, XXII, 35) to think that Abraham could have been the uncle only, and not the half-brother of his wife, was that in the opinion of these Fathers, a marriage with a half-sister, was even in the time of the patriarch so contrary to right order, that a man of Abraham's sanctity could not have contracted it.

²⁹ Gen. XI, 29.

³⁰ In Num. XXVI, 59, Jochabed is designated as the daughter of Levi. In Ex. VI, 20, she is called "*dodha*" (aunt). This in the LXX, strange to say, is rendered "*the daughter of the brother of his father.*" The Vulgate translates it "*patruelis.*"

³¹ On the question of authorship and date of composition of Lev. XVIII-XXVI and for literature thereon see "*The Levitical Priests,*" by Samuel Ives Curtiss, Jr., Edinburgh, 1877, pp. 69 and ff. For the same question concerning Deut. see Hummelauer, "*Com. in Deut.*," introduc., p. 5 et seq. in *Cur. "Scrip. Sacr. Lethielleux,"* Paris, 1901.

³² These forbid marriage with a mother, a granddaughter, whether daughter of a son or of a daughter, with a stepmother's daughter, a paternal aunt, and finally with a maternal aunt. Lev. XX and Deut. XXVII prohibit no consanguineous marriage not already forbidden in Lev. XVIII, but Lev. XX, 17, declares that he who marries "*the daughter of his father or the daughter of his mother*" shall, with the partner of his guilt "*be slain in the sight of their people,*" while Lev. XX, 19, prescribes that a nephew and aunt maternal, or paternal, that shall enter into marital relations with each other

hibitions directed to the male rather than to the female would inculcate primarily reverence for the person of the father as the head of the family. This high position and authority of the polygamous father the prohibitions of Lev. XVIII, 6-8, ever suppose, sanction and immediately regard. And because the union of an uncle and niece, such as was that of Nachor and Melsha, did not cast upon this paternal preëminence the shadow of disparagement that was thought to be offered it by the alliance of a son and an aunt, the former of these marriages escaped the prohibition pronounced against the latter.³³

Centered about the father the Israelitish family formed a group more or less independent and self-sufficient. In the marked division that set off the polygamous households of this people, one from another, the bonds of relationship between the children of brothers and sisters were so loosened that the reason for constituting a matrimonial impediment to the intermarriage of cousins german which might exist in different conditions of society, is seen to have not yet prevailed.³⁴

"shall bear their iniquity." Finally Deut. XXVII, 22, testifies to the deep reprobation in which matrimonial alliance with a sister the daughter of father or mother is held, by crying upon it a curse.

The opinion of those who declare that these prohibitions refer not to marriage but to incest outside of wedlock, is generally repudiated. See S. E. Dwight, "The Hebrew Wife," p. 48, ff.; also Michaelis, "Com. on the Laws of Moses," trans. by A. Smith, pp. 46-47.

³³ It is true the Old Testament makes record of no indisputable instance of marriage contracted between an uncle and niece, that of Othoniel and Axa (Jos. XV, 17) being questionable on account of the uncertainty regarding the degree of kinship existing between Othoniel and the father of his wife. We learn though from Josephus that Joseph the son of Onias, the high priest, married his niece and the manner in which, according to the historian, this alliance was brought about would lead us to believe that it offered no violation to law or custom among the Jews (Josephus, Ant. XII, 4, 6). The marriage of Herod the Great and his two sons will also be remembered. But as Herod the Great married his half sister (Joseph., op. cit., XVII, 1, §3) and Herod Antipas his brother's wife, both of which unions were clear offenses against the law, it were manifestly unwarrantable to conclude that the matrimonial alliances of these kings with their respective nieces, bore reliable testimony to the legality of such marriages among their countrymen. There is, however, a well-known incident connected with the union of Herod Antipas, that gives it an evidential value which otherwise it would not possess. This incident was the rebuke administered to Antipas by St. John the Baptist. This Herod, it will be recalled, was censured for having espoused Herodias, his brother's wife, no mention being made of the fact that in so doing he had also married his own niece. Had the alliance been unlawful on this last-named ground as well, we may safely assume that the stern Precursor would not have failed to declare it so. Moreover, Herodias was the niece of Herod Philip, her first husband, just as she was of her second, yet the Baptist refers to this former marriage as to a perfectly legitimate union (Joseph., op. cit., XVII, 1, 3; XVIII, 5, 4. Mark VI, 17, sqq.).

³⁴ St. Ambrose endeavors to deter Paternus from joining in marriage the son and granddaughter of the latter on the ground of an interdict thought to be implied

But not only did family range apart from family, among the Jews, but as was natural where there was a plurality of wives, sub-families arose. Rachael and Lia and the concubines of Jacob abode in their own separate tents (Gen. XXXI, 33) and were severally under the one head, the genius of a household quite complete in itself. Members of a different sub-family, brothers and sisters agnatic, might easily come to entertain for each other sentiments that normally could find no place among children reared in the mutually intimate companionship ordinarily following upon the circumstance of birth from a common mother. So it was Abraham took to wife his half-sister Sarah, and as we would infer from Gen. XX, 12, the Hebrews in the patriarchal period were not unaccustomed to contract the same kind of marriages. That they ceased for a time to enter into these unions after the promulgation of Lev. XVIII, 9-11 seems most probable, considering the strikingly forceful expression which they heard given to the prohibition against marriage with a half-sister and the dire punishment with which a violation of this law was threatened. The incident of Amnon and Tamar (2 Kings XIII, 13) however would lead us to suspect that, even in the days of David, the interdiction placed upon such marriages was not rigidly enforced, and we gather from Ezekiel XXII, 11, how persistently the temptation to such form of incest continued with this people.

In examining the legislation enacted against incest among the Hindus we notice the markedly greater extent to which kinship stretches out from the paternal as compared with the maternal line. "In all pure Hindu Society," says Alfred Lyall, "the law which regulates the degrees, within which marriage is interdicted, proceeds from the theory that between agnatic relatives *connubium* is impossible."³⁵ This appears clearly in the law of Manu, which declares that "a (damsel) who is neither a

in Lev. XVIII, 6; the saint arguing that, since the alliance between cousins german was forbidden, much more so was the union between persons of closer kinship. S. Ambr. ad Pater, Epis. LX; cf. Migne, P. L., col. 1183. But St. Ambrose puts too wide a meaning upon Lev. XVIII 6. And as there is no prohibition in the Scripture quoted, against the intermarriage of cousins german the principle that "he who constrains to the lesser does not absolve from but binds also to the greater," which the Bishop of Milan lays down, finds not the application he would make of it.

³⁵ A. C. Lyall, "Asiatic Studies, Religious and Social," p. 156.

Sapinda on the mother's side, nor belongs to the same family on the father's side is recommended to twice-born men for wedlock and conjugal union.'"³⁶ The Sapinda relationship lasts to the sixth degree,³⁷ but descent from the same family on the father's side which constitutes one a member of the same gotra³⁸ and is made known by the possession of a common surname, gives rise to an impediment that goes along the male line indefinitely.

Mr. McLennan is undoubtedly right in describing the continuous impediment to intermarriage on the male side among the Hindus as a relic of a former social condition among this people. Such a bar to intermarriage arose from the practice, we shall have occasion to describe later, of never contracting marital union with a member of the same gotra or clan.

Incapable of keeping but an easy and loose kind of record the members of these clans would choose one of their ancestral lines to the neglect of the other in tracing their clan-relationship. Among the Hindus, as among the more advanced clans, this relationship would be reckoned from the father's side. In some editions of the Laws of Manu it is specifically stated that descent from the same father is made known by the possession of the same family name. The fact of clan kinship therefore was in the beginning declared by a common surname and hence between those of the same surname marriage was prohibited. Hence also a one-sided and disproportionate system of relationship was inevitable.

The Hindus in marking their kinship ever kept in mind origin from a common clan or gotra. It would be quite natural however that with some peoples the remembrance of a near relationship should be lost sight of in the name which at first connoted this relationship and the sign should come to be regarded rather than the thing signified. We observe this in the case of the Chinese.

³⁶ "The Laws of Manu," III, 5. The Brahmana (the sacerdotal), the Kshatriya (the governing and military), the Vaisya (the agricultural and mercantile) castes are the twice-borne ones, Manu, X, 4.

³⁷ Manu, V, 60. According to Gautama, Vishnu and Narada, Sapinda relationship does not go beyond the fourth degree where the common ancestor is a female.

³⁸ Among the Brahmans membership in the same gotra means descent from the same Rishi.

Among this people the male only is accounted the primitive stock of the family tree, as the male descendents only are considered the branches of this tree. These descendents never take but the father's name and between those of the same name, no matter how remote is the degree of consanguinity between them, marriage is prohibited.³⁹ Since among this people surnames are extraordinarily few, there being, according to Mr. Medhurst,⁴⁰ but 530 of them throughout the whole Chinese Empire, the limitation which is thus put upon intermarriage is seen to be narrow indeed.

The penalties attached by the Chinese to the violation of the law regarding intermarriage between those of the same stock are definitely prescribed. The Rev. Pierre Hoang, in his excellent brochure, "*Le Mariage Chinois*," tells us that such unions are declared void, and in cases where the parties escape the death punishment, the woman is separated from her consort, and the nuptial presents are confiscated. We are informed by the same writer that if a man and woman who are of the same stock, but beyond the fourth degree—not counting the stock—shall marry, they shall each of them receive 100 blows of the rod. Relatives on the paternal side, to a closer degree, who shall intermarry shall be sent into exile for a determined period. But he who shall take to wife his paternal grand-aunt, or a cousin german of his father, born to a paternal grand-uncle, or his cousin german born to a paternal uncle, shall, with the partner of his incest, be promptly strangled to death. Finally, he who shall marry a paternal aunt, a sister or a daughter of his son, shall, with his marital mate, be speedily decapitated. Kinship through the female line is termed, among the Chinese, external relationship, and the impediments to intermarriage following upon it are not as extensive as those resulting from connection through the male. Thus marriage with a uterine sister entails three years' exile and 100 stripes of the rod for the woman, and military banishment for the man. So too, the children of two sisters or of a brother and sister may intermarry; never, however, may the offspring of two brothers.⁴¹

³⁹ Le P. Pierre Hoang, "*Le Mariage Chinois au point de vue legal*," p. 6.

⁴⁰ W. H. Medhurst, "*Marriage Affinity and Inheritance in China*," in *Trans. Roy. As. Soc., China Branch*, Vol. IV, quoted by Westermarck, "*History of Human Marriage*," p. 305.

⁴¹ Hoang, op. cit., pp. 46, ff., and 51, ff.

The Greeks of the post-Homeric age esteemed lightly their marriage bonds, the Lacedæmonians especially so, yet the grosser forms of incest they shunned. Tertullian, it is true, accused the Macedonians of having indulged the intimacies of which the Persians were held guilty, but his accusation which seems to rest on no other ground than the outburst of ribaldry which greeted the enactment of the play of *Œdipus* in the theater at Macedon⁴² is not sufficiently supported. And both Tatian and Diogenes Laertius refer to the abhorrence entertained by the Greeks towards the unions reported as peculiar to the Persians.⁴³ Marriage with a half-sister, however, was permitted to the Greeks, both by the person or persons whom history calls *Lycurgus*, and by *Solon*; the former as we learn from *Philo*⁴⁴ allowing the Spartans to take to wife a sister uterine but not agnatic, while the latter gave the Athenians liberty to espouse a sister agnatic but not uterine. With the liberty accorded by *Solon*, *Cimon* married his half-sister *Elpinice*,⁴⁵ as did *Archeptolis Mnasiptolema*,⁴⁶ *Alexander* the son of *Pyrrhus*, *Olympias*,⁴⁷ *Mithridates Laodice*,⁴⁸ *Mausolus*, *Artemisia*,⁴⁹ and *Dionysius of Syracuse*, *Sophrosyna*.⁵⁰

Marital union with a half-sister, legal among the Greeks, was forbidden to the Roman whose law regarding marriage of near kin was a reflex of the high domestic virtue which characterized the citizen of the Imperial City in its nobler days. This law the Roman, even in the season of wildest debauchery, did not forget or disregard. For though otherwise depraved, his horror towards incestuous alliances ever remained. To this sentiment of horror, their poets gave testimony.

Says *Lucan*

—cui fas implere parentem
Quid rear esse nefas?⁵¹

and *Virgil*, pointing to one among the damned tells us:

⁴² Tertullian, "Ad Nationes," CXVI.

⁴³ Tatian, loc. cit., Diog. Laert., op. cit.

⁴⁴ Philo, "De Spec. Leg. Thomas Mangey," 1742, Vol. II, p. 303.

⁴⁵ Nepos, "Vita Cimonis, Cap. I.

⁴⁶ Plut., in Them., tom. II, p. 500.

⁴⁷ Justinus, Lib. XXVII, C. I.

⁴⁸ Justinus, Lib. XXXVII, C. III.

⁴⁹ Strabo, Lib. XIV, C. II.

⁵⁰ Plut. in Dion, C. VI, tom. V.

⁵¹ Lucanus, Pharsal, 8.

Hic thalamum invasit natæ, vetitosque hymenæos.⁵²

We may quote here, too, as bearing the same idea, the story told by Agathias of the Roman philosopher who, warned in a dream,

Μή θαψῆς τὸν ἄθαπτον, ἔα κυσι κῆρυμα γένεσθαι
Γῆ παντῶν μήτηρ μητροφθόρον οὐ δεχέτ' ἀνδρα.⁵³

awakes to find that the offended earth had in very truth spewed out, as it were, the body which he had given to it.

The Roman family was founded, not upon ties of blood, but upon the power vested in the *paterfamilias*. The Latin word "familia," derived from the Oscan term "famel," signifying a slave, bears witness to the absolute sway that originally rested in the head of the Roman household. Yet despite this exalted authority of the husband over the wife no distinction was drawn between the blood relationship with the father and that with the mother in prescribing the degrees of kinship prohibiting intermarriage. These prohibiting degrees extended along the right ascending and descending line indefinitely. In the collateral line those within the third degree could not intermarry. A single exception was made to this law in the case of a brother's daughter, which was brought about "when the divine Claudius took to wife Agrippina the daughter of his brother."⁵⁴ But Constantine, in accordance with the sentiments of the Roman people, afterwards repealed the exception introduced by Claudius forbidding marriage with a brother's daughter under pain of death. Beyond the third degree, marriage was allowable, except in the instance of a granddaughter, "for when we may not lawfully marry the daughter of any one, we may not marry the granddaughter." And as of the granddaughter, so also of the great-granddaughter and the sister of a great-grandfather. These persons, though beyond the third degree, were considered as coming within the scope of the prohibition against unions in the right ascending and descending line, connection with them being likened to that between parent and child.⁵⁵ From a text of Ulpian we learn that in the ancient Roman law, the prohibition to intermarry extended to first

⁵² Æneid, Lib. VI, 623.

⁵³ Agathias, op. cit., p. 50 E et seq.

⁵⁴ Gai., I, 62.

⁵⁵ Instit Just., I, 10, 3. Dig. XXIII, 2, 7, 2. Ibid., XXXIII, 2, 39.

cousins.⁵⁶ Later on we find such a marriage at one time forbidden, at another made lawful, until eventually it is interdicted under penalties most severe by Theodosius the Great.

In passing to a consideration of marriage between near of kin among savages, we recall the passage of Andromache, in which Euripides makes Hermione declare that amidst all barbarians, father married with daughter, son with mother and brother with sister, without any hindrance from law or custom.⁵⁷ The statement of the poet is dramatically stronger for its sweeping character, but for the same reason it can possess but little historic value. Ovid is not more definite when he tells us

Gentes tamen esse feruntur
In quibus et nato genitrix et nata parenti
Jungitur.⁵⁸

According to Herodotus the Massagetæ held their wives in common, while the Auseans had no marriage but lived together like gregarious beasts. Solinus testifies to the promiscuous cohabitation of the sexes among the Garamantes, and Aristotle refers to a similar practice among the Libyans.⁵⁹ But these instances do not afford examples of a disregard of kinship as prohibitive of intermarriage. Herodotus indeed tells us that the Massagetæ, though communal marriage existed among them, had each his own wife, and this, together with the fact that the Auseans were at pains, according to this historian, to determine by artificial means the paternal parentage of their healthy offspring, leads us to think that the so-called promiscuity of these people was similar to the promiscuity observed among the Spartans. These Greeks, we know, recognized no crime in adultery,⁶⁰ and cared not who was the father of their children as long as a

⁵⁶ Ulp. Frag., 5, 6. See also Plutarch, Quæst. Rom., 6.

⁵⁷ Euripides, Andromache, 173 et seq.

τοῦτον πᾶν το βαρβαρον γένος
πατήρ τε θυγατρὶ παῖς τε μητρὶ μίγνται
κορὴ τὰδὲλφω . . .
καὶ τῶν οὐδὲν ἐξείργει νόμος.

⁵⁸ Ovid Metam., Lib. X, 331.

⁵⁹ Herod., "Hist. Lib." I, C. 216. Ibid., Lib. IV, 180. Solinus, "De Memorab. Mundi," C. XXXII. Aristotle, Pol., II, 3, 9.

⁶⁰ Xenoph., De Rep. Laced., I, 789.

strong progeny was born to the state,⁶¹ and yet we also know that relationship through the father operated to check intermarriage among them. The same may be safely said of the Garamantes and Libyans. Moreover, it must be borne in mind that the evidence for a general Hetairism is not coextensive with the evidence for the absence of any horror of incest. The one may be present amidst a wide prevalence of the other. The cases mentioned by McLennan of conjugal infidelity, of polyandry, of the wantonness of the women in some savage tribes⁶² are not therefore instances in which kinship within certain degrees was not recognized as a stop to intermarriage. The same must be affirmed of the examples, which Sir John Lubbock and others adduce of certain modern savages who recognize no marriage as we understand it.⁶³ To show that these savages take no heed of relationship as an impediment to marriage, a more specific and particular testimony is necessary than that which would merely disclose a wide promiscuity.

That, however, an impediment to intermarriage springing from nearness of kinship quite universally exists among savages, we know from the ample testimony of travelers which is detailed for us in the works of anthropologists. It is observed that, as a rule, the number of persons affected by this impediment is greater among uncivilized communities than among those more advanced in the social scale. Indeed, among savages the bar to intermarriage reaches beyond the pale of relationship by blood and prevents marital union between members of the same clan. We have seen that the original families into which the Hindus and Chinese were divided had, as their distinguishing mark, a common surname. Among many savages, however, a sign more readily suggesting itself to the untutored mind designates family from family, clan from clan. This is the name of some vegetable or animal—the *kobong* of the Australian, the *totem* of the American Indian. And between those of the same kobong or totem marriage is never contracted.

⁶¹ Aristotle, *Polit.*, II, 9.

⁶² John F. McLennan, "Primitive Marriage," p. 176 and ff.

⁶³ Sir John Lubbock, "The Origin of Civilization and the Primitive Condition of Man," pp. 86, 95.

The practice among savages of marrying outside of their own clan Mr. McLennan has called by the fitting name exogamy. This custom, as is clear, puts a check to marriage between persons that are unrelated by blood. Nevertheless, as we shall see, in a following article, from the nature of the familial conditions of the early clans among whom exogamy obtained, it is to be identified with the bar, which in civilized societies, stops consanguineous unions.

The practice then of seeking a wife from a strange clan appears among people so diverse and so widely separated that its nature cannot be set off by the narrow characterization that may fit institutions of a purely local compass. And as many anthropologists would most firmly deny that such a practice could be prompted by an instinct of nature they are at special pains to show its evolution from the influence solely of external conditions. Thus Mr. McLennan is of the opinion that exogamy must have arisen from a scarcity of women in the tribe, brought about by female infanticide, the unbalancing in the proportion of the sexes compelling the men to resort to the capture of foreign women for wives. This "usage induced by necessity would in time establish a prejudice among the tribes observing it—a prejudice strong as a principle of religion, as every prejudice relating to marriage is apt to be—against marrying women of their own stock."⁶⁴

Mr. Spencer is ready with a different account. According to this writer women of a hostile tribe—and tribes at the period of which it is question, were ever hostile one to the other—were sought as trophies of war. The possession of these captured women as prizes by a few inevitably incites a desire for them in the many, "and as the number of those who are without them decreases, the brand of disgrace attaching to them will grow more decided; until, in the most warlike tribes it becomes an imperative requirement that a wife shall be obtained from another tribe—if not in open war, then by private abduction."⁶⁵

Finally, Sir John Lubbock attributes this custom to the determination on the part of the men of the tribe to gain wives

⁶⁴ McLennan, "Studies in Ancient History," p. 111; "Primitive Marriage," p. 140.

⁶⁵ Herbert Spencer, "The Principles of Sociology," Vol. I, pp. 619-621.

as their own private property. "We must remember," "says this anthropologist, "that under the communal system the women of the tribe were all common property. No one could appropriate one of them to himself without infringing on the general rights of the tribe. Women taken in war were, on the contrary, in a different position. The tribe as a tribe had no right to them and men surely would reserve to themselves exclusively their own prizes. These captives then would naturally become the wives in our sense of the term."⁶⁶

The positive variance with objective reality presented by these different theories anthropologists themselves have not been slow to point out to one another. Mr. McLennan's hypothesis, it will be observed, rests upon the two postulates of female infanticide and the resultant scarcity of women. Mr. Fison has shown that Mr. McLennan has absurdly exaggerated the existence of female infanticide, as he has also shown that the motive alleged by the latter for such inhuman conduct could not have availed with the savage.⁶⁷ The supposition of female infanticide disproved, the consequent supposition of a scarcity of women must be discredited.

The theories of Mr. Spencer and Sir John Lubbock would take for granted that, in the battlings between savage tribes, individuals are wont to take captives of war. For only when the individual was the victor could the individual have the spoil. But Mr. McLennan well says that booty of war was ordinarily the accomplishment of groups, and, as such, subject to the disposition of many rather than of one.⁶⁸ Individual seizures of women, no doubt, were frequent, but they never could have been so common as to give rise to the system of exogamy. Moreover, as Westermarck justly remarks, the process of winning a wife, pictured by the authors just mentioned, could have been the exclusive performance of the stronger and conquering tribes. But where would the weaker and conquered tribes secure their matrimonial consorts?⁶⁹ Surely if there were scarcity of women anywhere, it would be among those who had lost their female companions to the rough prowess of their

⁶⁶ Lubbock, *op. cit.*, 135-136.

⁶⁷ Fison and Howitt, "Kamilaroi and Kurnai," p. 135, ff.

⁶⁸ McLennan, "Studies in Ancient History," p. 345.

⁶⁹ Edward Westermarck, "The History of Human Marriage," p. 315.

hostile neighbors. Yet exogamy was a custom among the weaker and conquered, no less than among the stronger and conquering tribes.

The anthropologists we have been considering might, it is true, reply to the question, put by Westermarck, why savages did not also take to wife the women of their own tribes, by contending that the scarcity of women would permit only of polyandry or communal marriage which, indeed, they say was originally practised. But if so, why do we not detect this polyandry and communal marriage among the men and women of the same tribe, coexisting with the capture of foreign women for individual wives? From the coexistence of such low unions the savage admittedly is not deterred through considerations of morality.

The theories offered by Messrs. Tylor and Morgan to explain the origin of exogamy, though more plausible than the ones just mentioned, are quite as insufficient. Mr. Tylor thinks that the savage was induced to this usage by a desire of political advantage and preservation to be secured by affiliation with a foreign tribe;⁷⁰ while Mr. Morgan is of the idea that the intermarriage of brothers and sisters in a group which he calls the "consanguine family" ceased because of the evils "which could not forever escape human observation."⁷¹ These evils, we take it, were the physical defects that were supposed to be discernible in the offspring of marriages between near of kin. It needs, however, but little knowledge of the savage to be convinced that he would never submit to the kind of abstinence entailed by exogamy through the considerations presented by Messrs. Tylor and Morgan. Moreover, the hypothesis of the latter assumes in the savage motives that failed to suggest themselves to the greatest of the ancient law-givers when decreeing against marriage of near kin. These motives did not, as far as we can know, occur to Moses or the framers of the Laws of Manu when they formulated their enactments against incest. And the history of the Church reveals no thought of the physical deterioration of progeny as following from mar-

⁷⁰ Edward B. Tylor in *Jour. Anthr. Inst.*, Vol. XVIII, p. 267.

⁷¹ Lewis H. Morgan, "Ancient Society," p. 424.

riages of consanguinity, until towards the close of the sixth century. Indeed, such a result, far from being obvious to the modern scholar, could hardly occur to the savage mind.

It is true that an Australian legend recorded by Mr. Fison makes the Good Spirit Muramura prohibit intermarriages among members of the same branch of a tribe because of the evil effects observed to have issued from the intermarriages of closest kin which took place after the creation.⁷² But the particular nature of these evil effects the tradition does not disclose. Nor are we warranted in setting them down as the weakness or defect of offspring. Incapable of catching the purpose of a hidden law, the savage could only account for the extensive and striking phenomenon of exogamy by picturing it as brought about by the decree of a god. He could not but think that, in violating this practice, he would bring upon himself a condign evil. Did he have a clear idea of the nature of this evil he would not fail, considering its significance, to give it a more specific description.

Mr. Morgan lays stress on the foregoing tradition because of the basis of probability which he claims it establishes for the "consanguine family" described above;⁷³ just as Mr. McLennan attaches importance to the tradition, current among various peoples, that marriage was instituted by some legislator because of the evidence afforded by these traditions of a former state of promiscuity.⁷⁴ But because the Egyptians attribute the origin of marriage to Menes, the Chinese to Fohi, the Hindus to Svetaketu, the Greeks to Cecrops, a scientific argument is no more presented for a former state of promiscuity, than the same kind of an argument is afforded for the former existence of snakes in a particular island, by the legend that a certain holy man once expelled these reptiles from that island.

The stage of sexual promiscuity, Mr. Morgan confesses, "lies concealed in the misty antiquity of mankind beyond the reach of positive knowledge."⁷⁵ Yet into these primeval shades most anthropologists, nothing daunted, rush. And when we read

⁷² Fison and Howitt, *op. cit.*, p. 25.

⁷³ Morgan in introduction to Fison and Howitt's "Kamilaroi and Kurnai," p. 4.

⁷⁴ McLennan, "Primitive Marriage," pp. 174-175.

⁷⁵ Morgan, *op. cit.*, p. 502.

of the grand generalizations based upon the custom observed among some peoples, of tracing kinship through females, upon the "expiation for marriage" and the *jus primæ noctis*, upon the practice of lending wives, upon the greater esteem paid by the Greeks to the *Hetairæ* than to their legitimate wives and finally upon the classificatory system of consanguinity found in 139 tribes or races, we cannot but express our accord with the judgment passed by Fairbairn upon our modern anthropologies, understanding of course the words of this judgment in the sense in which they are accepted by him who uses them. "Our modern anthropologies, says this author, are in heart and essence, as speculative as mediæval scholasticism, or as any system of ancient metaphysics. There is no region where a healthy and fearless scepticism is more needed than in the literature which relates to ethnography. There is no people so difficult to understand and to interpret as a savage people; there is no field . . . where testimonies are so contradictory, or so apt to dissolve under analysis, into airy nothings."⁷⁶

Shunning then the domain of mere surmise we find among savage as well as among civilized mankind a recognized bar to the intermarriage of near kin. Instances, indeed, are to be found, as we have noted, where no such impediment is recognized, but these must be considered in the order of extraordinary exceptions. These exceptions must be reckoned also as examples of a perverted moral instinct which may become common to a whole people, as we know it to be found among individuals. And so the habit of incest in the case of the Egyptians was but one form of a depravity to which, as we learn from Lev. XVIII, 3, 21 et seq., these people were addicted. Thus, too, according to Mr. Bancroft, the Kadiaks of North-western America, while given to the grossest forms of incest, practiced other unnatural vices.⁷⁷

The Persians, however, beyond the custom of marrying their own mothers, did not show signs of being possessed of a more vitiated moral sense than other nations of antiquity. The

⁷⁶ Andrew Martin Fairbairn, "The Philosophy of the Christian Religion," p. 204.

⁷⁷ Hubert Howe Bancroft, "The Native Races of the Pacific States of North America," Vol. I, pp. 81-82.

irregular unions which they learned to form from their foreign priests were, no doubt, originally practiced by the Magi through an overweening desire to keep religious traditions pure from strange and unfriendly influences. The declaration of Mr. McLennan that such marriages were "those of hordes who consecrated an incestuous promiscuity into a system"⁷⁸ is seen from what we have said of these unions to be absolutely contrary to historical fact.

JOHN WEBSTER MELODY.

⁷⁸ McLennan, "Primitive Marriage," p. 223.

RELIGIOUS LIBERTY IN THE UNITED STATES.

Among all the differences between the United States and the Old World by far the most salient is the separation of Church and State in the former. Perhaps, too, on no other point are we so much misunderstood by the latter. Our customs in this matter are regarded as the outcome of religious indifference and the expression of hostility of the State towards the Church; as the product of atheistic theorists who seek to level all other countries down to our measurements. Neither one of these suppositions is true. Americans yield to no people in religious, nay, Christian zeal. The State in separating from the Church is actuated very largely by friendliness, believing that the Church can best attend to its own affairs without that governmental support which is only too often more of a hindrance than a help.

Nor is separation of Church and State with us the outcome or the expression of any abstract theory. It is pre-eminently a *fact*. True! there are theorists among us. But as a people we are practical at least so far as we do not believe in holding on to a system of government after that system has been found impracticable. Our European cousins call us a "nation of shop-keepers." They will also admit that we keep our shops in very good order. For the sake of argument, we may accept the description. It will aid considerably in explaining our differences. As Mr. Bryce says in his "American Commonwealth" (II, 575), one of the causes of our separation of Church and State lies in our *commercial* view of the State. "It is more like a commercial company . . . for the management of certain business in which all who reside within its bounds are interested . . . but for the most part leaving the shareholders to themselves. That an organization of this kind should trouble itself otherwise than as a matter of police with the opinions or conduct of its members would be as unnatural as for a railway company to enquire how many of the shareholders were total abstainers." Now one step farther. What has made us so practical? The imperfections of Old

World theories. Without asserting that a union of Church and State is a false theory or inapplicable under any conditions, Americans severally hold that such a theory has not been so uniformly successful as to warrant a blind acceptance of it under all conditions. If this be commercialism, shop-keeping, then it were high time for some of our critics to lay aside their imperial insignia and don working clothes.

The historical origin and progress of this new element in civilization, must therefore claim close and sympathetic study. Judged by theory we will be misunderstood because we are pre-eminently a fact, a stupendous fact, and can be appreciated correctly only as a fact. In the book¹ before us the reader will find an extremely interesting and able sketch of the origin of separation of Church and State in America as well as of its historical connection with the struggle for political independence. The author is well equipped for the work. His research-work has been vast; the arrangement of the same is lucid; the style is pleasant; and, best of all, his treatment of such a delicate question is eminently fair and courteous to all parties concerned. Defects there are, but not many. The title of the book, for instance, is unhappy, because "liberty" is a word susceptible of so many and varied meanings, and in fact, the author himself seems rather ill at ease in his attempt in the opening chapter to define it. "Separation of Church and State" would have been a more felicitous title. His admiration for Roger Williams is rather exaggerated and he is incorrect in stating (p. 482) that Rhode Island never "admitted into statute or practice any spirit of repression," since it is well known that Catholics were disfranchised at least by 1728 if not earlier. Finally, the estimate of the influence of Jonathan Edwards (pp. 485-9) is so exaggerated as to border on the absurd. It is surely astounding to hear that Edwards exerted a more profound influence on the minds of men than "any other man since Luther," and that in theology "he made a place for his name along with those of Augustine and Calvin." But these defects are few and pardonable in a way. On the whole the author has written an excellent work which we

¹"The Rise of Religious Liberty in America," by Sanford H. Cobb, 8vo, pp. xx and 541, Macmillan, New York, 1902.

cordially commend and whose conclusions we accept in the main.

1. *Colonial Beginnings.*—The growth of religious liberty (by which words we mean separation of State and Church) in America was slow. The early settlers, be it remembered, were all Europeans; hence, they reflected the views of Europeans. Now in the early part of the seventeenth century, union of Church and State was the still generally accepted theory and practice. Nevertheless, a counter movement had set in. Thomas More a century earlier had described in *Utopia* a different condition of affairs. The fratricidal religious wars of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries had left a feeling of weariness in thinking minds, which found expression in the compromise Treaty of Westphalia in 1648. The cause of religious liberty found more and more open advocates among even such intolerant men as Oliver Cromwell, Sir Henry Vane, and others. So then, there was a double current. The English colonies reflected both. Most of them started out with intolerance, a few with more or less modified toleration.

Hence, several groups are distinguishable. In the first there was a strict union of State and Church. In this group we find Massachusetts, Plymouth, New Haven, Connecticut, and New Hampshire with their congregational establishments; then Virginia and the Carolinas in which the Church of England was established from the very beginning and remained so until the era of the Revolution. It is curious to note the different motives of "establishment" in these sub-groupings. In the northern colonies the union of Church and State was based on the conviction that the State should be religious. In the southern ones it was based on the conviction that the Church was necessarily a department of the State, so that religious dissent was a civil disorder.

A second group is composed of Georgia, Maryland, New York and New Jersey, where changes occurred. Thus Maryland under Catholic rule practiced religious freedom, but under Protestant rule was forced into establishing the Anglican Church. Likewise, the other colonies accepted the same establishment with more or less completeness.

A last group comprises Rhode Island, Pennsylvania, and the latter's off-shoot, Delaware, in which colonies no Church was ever established, and in which religious intolerance had the least sway.

But in none of the colonies was there absolute religious equality before the law during all of their course. We can grant, for argument's sake, that Rhode Island, for a long while after the foundation of Providence in 1636, taught and practised religious equality. Yet, it is undeniable that later on (certainly by 1728-9) Catholics were disfranchised. And, speaking of Rhode Island, we note in passing our conviction that Maryland preceded it as well as all others in the practice of religious liberty, although the adverse circumstances in which Lord Baltimore found himself placed prevented him from expressly, and in so many words embodying it in his Maryland charter of 1632. However, a comparison of Williams and Lord Baltimore is, at bottom, somewhat idle, as at best it is a priority of only a few years. Both were undoubtedly great and broad-minded men, pioneers in the cause of religious freedom, though not its originators. A broad view will give credit to both for equal liberality and for having worked out the problem in the best way suitable to each, one as a preacher, the other as a practical man of business, both as founders of colonies.

II. *Subsequent Development.*—The early outlook for liberty was, therefore, none too encouraging, although, even then far brighter than in Europe. Yet, the movement gained ground steadily. It was gaining ground even in old Europe. The almost universal religious indifference characterizing the Europe of the later seventeenth and entire eighteenth centuries, tells plainly enough that men's minds had swung to the opposite extreme of atheism and scepticism out of utter disgust at the religious bickerings of the preceding age. When at Westphalia the opposing troops laid down their weapons, the theologians as well laid down their pens and folio volumes. The age of Voltaire, Du Barry, Bolingbroke and Chesterfield was weary of religion and sought relief in contemptuous agnosticism and grosser epicureanism. America felt the movement. Chiefly in Virginia, where the established Church never was regarded as much more than a department of the

State, and little respected, owing to the scandalous lives of its clergy. In the northern colonies, the minute intolerance of such governments as Massachusetts had disgusted even its own admirers. The "Blue Laws" gradually lapsed into desuetude and became objects of contempt. The experiment of a theocracy, modelled on the Old Testament, had proved an utter and inglorious failure. Meanwhile, in little neighboring Rhode Island, the "lively experiment" (as Charles II called it) of a separation of Church and State had proved itself not only a success but a blessing.

Above all, it should be remembered that the colonies were settled, almost universally, in the North by religious refugees from European persecution. At first, indeed, few of them learned the lesson of toleration from their own sufferings. But later on, that lesson was sure to impress itself, grow clearer and clearer, in proportion as their very diversity of religious conviction rendered a union of Church and State satisfactory to none but the dominant faction. Out of the very necessity of facts the idea sprang. A few theorists there were like Williams. But to the most the problem presented itself as a *practical* one, as a condition of affairs that demanded immediate solution.

Another motive lay in the absurd attempt at a general establishment of the Church of England by the appointment of colonial bishops, a fact which is intimately connected with the political struggle for independence. To understand this, it should be remembered that there were no bishops of the Church of England resident in the colonies. This naturally led to a complete disorganization of it, even in the colonies like Virginia, where it was the established Church. In consequence, appeal after appeal was made to England to have bishops appointed. The appeal seemed reasonable enough at first sight, and no one would have questioned it if he were convinced that it was a question affecting only the internal affairs of the Anglican Church. As a matter of fact, it did affect every resident in the colony, Catholic and Dissenter no less than Anglican, and after this fashion.

Bishops so appointed would become *ipso facto* members of the Anglican State-Church in England. Now, a bishop in England was an officer of the State. Parliament appointed and

removed him at will, and sustained him out of public taxation, and often endowed him with important civil powers—like a “Bishop of Durham.” So then the appointment of an Anglican bishop became involved in the ever-increasing quarrel between the colonies and the home government. The former objected to such appointments of bishops for precisely the same reasons that it objected to the tax on tea: *i. e.*, such appointments would be made by Parliament without any representation on the part of the colonists (pp. 474 and 475). Of course, there were other reasons for this attitude of hostility. Such were the memories of what the colonists’ forefathers had suffered in England at the hands of Anglican bishops. But the main cause was political, as is proved by the fact that the opposition to Anglican bishops ceased as soon as the winning of political independence rendered vain any lingering fear that these bishops would have any political power.

Another reason for believing the agitation chiefly political lies in the attitude of the episcopal clergy on the political questions at issue between the home government and the colonies. The clergy were uncompromising Tories. They were staunch supporters of Parliament, and frowned upon all attempts of the colonies to maintain their right to representation. There foremost members openly admitted that the enmity towards Parliament and King was necessarily bound up with antipathy towards the Anglican establishment. Certainly the Anglican Church was a bitter and irreconcilable enemy of American independence, so far as its clergy were concerned. Its laity, be it said to their honor, were not generally in sympathy with its misguided clergy.

Thus, the cause of independence, or American Democracy, was indissolubly linked with that of American separation of Church and State. They had a common origin, a common history, and, we venture to predict, will have a common fate. “Fear of the Church of England,” said John Adams, “contributed as much as any other cause to arouse the attention, not only of the inquiring mind, but of the common people, and urged them to close thinking on the constitutional authority of Parliament over the Colonies” (pp. 478-9).

III. *The Revolution.*—It is not surprising, therefore, to find that political independence from England almost necessarily drew after it religious liberty, despite the fact that traces of religious bigotry still marred the constitutions and statute-books of some of the States. The movement in favor of liberty in matters of conscience had advanced a long distance during the century and a half intervening between the earliest colonization and the War of Independence. Colony after colony had fallen in with it, so that its ultimate complete success was now assured. But old ideas and customs die hard, and the spirit of religious intolerance fought to the last ditch, nor is it yet lifeless. There was still enough life in it to make it an absorbing issue when the new states came to consider the Federal Constitution in 1787. It is interesting to note exactly how far each state had advanced at that date.

“By brief grouping of them it appears that in only two out of thirteen was full and perfect freedom conceded by law. These were Rhode Island and Virginia. Six of the states, viz., New Hampshire, Connecticut, New Jersey, the two Carolinas and Georgia, insisted on Protestantism. Two were content with the Christian religion; Delaware and Maryland. Four—Pennsylvania, Delaware and the Carolinas—required assent to the divine inspiration of the Bible. Two—Pennsylvania and South Carolina—demanded a belief in heaven and hell. Three—New York, Maryland, and South Carolina—emphasized belief in one Eternal God. One—Delaware—required assent to the doctrine of the Trinity. And five—New Hampshire, Massachusetts, Connecticut, Maryland, and South Carolina—adhered to a religious establishment” (Cobb, 504).

It is curious and worthy of note that of these Virginia, which had started out as one of the most intolerant, had now become one of the most tolerant. The reason is worth investigating. It seems to have been due to Virginia's leadership in the struggle for political independence, another fact showing the close historical connection between the two fundamental elements in Americanism—democracy and religious liberty.

The very presence and intolerance of the established Anglican Church rendered the struggle in Virginia unusually bitter and long for the advocates of liberty. The state convention

which met in 1776 for the purpose of formally severing political relations with England adopted, as the sixteenth section of its famous "Bill of Rights," a statement according equal rights to all religions. This was the beginning of disestablishment, though the end did not come until the passing of the "Declaratory Act" of 1785.

The chief interest, however, in the study of this struggle in Virginia, lies in the personnel of the advocates of religious liberty. They were all the very men most prominent in the contemporary struggle for political liberty—Madison, Patrick Henry, Jefferson, R. H. Lee, Marshall and Washington. Patrick Henry presented the above-mentioned section of the Bill of Rights. Madison offered to it the amendment which left no loophole for the introduction of intolerance. Jefferson, of course, was a leader here as in all else, and he plunged with his accustomed impassioned eloquence into what he called "the severest struggles in which I have ever been engaged," Washington, Lee, and Marshall were ranged with him, though not perhaps, as radical. They approved a bill providing for a general assessment for the support of Christianity, but allowing everyone to signify to what church he wished his contribution paid. Probably it was meant as a compromise. But it was defeated by Jefferson and Madison on the obvious ground that it made Christianity the religion of the state to the oppression of all non-Christians. At all events, it is striking to find the great leaders in the political revolution substantially agreeing on and fighting for religious liberty. It is not surprising, therefore, to find religious liberty laid down as a fundamental of the American Constitution, drawn up in 1789 by these same leaders in the political struggle for independence.

When the Constitution was submitted to the states for approval in 1787, it contained this sole reference to religion: "No religious test shall ever be required as a qualification to any office or public trust under the United States." By most of the states this was not regarded as a sufficient protection of religious rights. Massachusetts alone regarded it as too liberal, for the spirit of Cotton Mather was yet abroad in that land of intolerance. The Puritan still shuddered at the idea that "Roman Catholics, Papists, and Pagans might be introduced

into office, and that Popery and the Inquisition may be established in America." But this one solitary cry for intolerance was drowned by the otherwise universal demand for a more unlimited freedom of religious observance. When the First Congress of the United States assembled, it considered the various amendments to the Constitution proposed by the different state conventions. Many of these concerned the rights of conscience. As a result Congress accepted, and put first into the Constitution the amendment reading: "Congress shall make no law respecting an establishment of religion or prohibiting the free exercise thereof." Thus, so far as the general government is concerned, the last relics of religious intolerance, of an established Church, were swept away by a few words which are majestic in their simple dignity. To one unacquainted with the varying struggles of which they are the outcome, they may seem meagre. But when we compare them with the verbose and awkward attempts made by the separate states to express their opposition to a union of Church and State, we are forced to admire their profundity and comprehensiveness. They are the "Requiem" of intolerance, and by their brevity express what is no longer, rather than what was. Here is no verbiage, but in simple words a simple and a great fact. It is the formula in which, after a century and a half of experiment, the friends of religious liberty thought best to embody their principles.

IV. *The Last Remnants*.—We would do well to remember that the adoption of religious freedom by the government in 1789, did not then, and perhaps does not now, necessarily imply its adoption in each particular state. "The Constitution conferred on the general government the right and duty to maintain in every state a republican form of government, but it bestowed no right of interference with the institutions of a religious character which any state might choose to establish, so long as the moral safety and the integrity of the nation were not involved. If, for example, one of the states should set aside its present form of government, and set up a monarchy, the national government under the Constitution would be required to stop such action. But if one of the states, even to-day, should change its own Constitution, and set up a State-Church, with

the perquisites and power of an establishment, and should put such Church upon the public treasury for support, the general government has no power to stop it'' (op. cit., p. 510).

As regards the present day, this statement of our author is not so certain as his language implies. It is certain beyond all doubt that the men of 1789 did so interpret the Constitution. But the powers of Congress have grown considerably since then. It interferes in many affairs of even lesser importance than those affecting religious liberty which a century ago were regarded as out of its scope, and a union of Church and State is so intensely abhorrent to the American mind, so opposed to all that we call Americanism, that most Americans, it is certain, would hold that Congress would be amply justified in the use of federal force to prevent the establishment of a Church in any part of the country.

The fact remains, however, that our forefathers did not consider the abolition of religious intolerance by the general government in 1789 tantamount to its abolition by state governments. "Each state was free to do as it willed in regard to the Church, individual liberty of worship, establishment, religious taxation, and religious tests. They carried over into their future statehood the special institutions obtaining in 1789, and used their own time and method of making what changes they desired. For this cause, though full freedom was the law of the nation, yet in some parts of the union, illiberal and oppressive restrictions obtained for many years, attended by more or less of struggle, until the last vestige of old distinctions was swept away: if indeed, it can be said that they are all gone even yet'' (op. cit., *ibid.*).

A few instances will illustrate the tenaciousness of the old traditions. Especially in Connecticut was the last struggle most interesting, both because of its intensity and of the light which it throws upon the relation between democracy and religious equality. Not until after 1818 was the Church disestablished there. One of the chief reasons why it existed so long was the support accorded it by the Federalists, whom it were more correct to term conservatives. Under their influence religious liberty actually became more restricted. Like so many conservatives of to-day, they confounded religious liberty with

the atheism and all the other outrageous exercises of the French Revolution, forgetful that the very same consequences in the political order could be urged by the reactionaries in civil government—the Tories, the Bourbons, the Bonapartists. Even when their feeble efforts were unavailing to stem the irresistible tide of liberty they gave up the struggle “hugging the dear error to the last.” “To many the change seemed to portend the day of doom. The venerable Timothy Dwight, the president of Yale, deprecated it until his death” (op. cit., p. 513).

In Massachusetts the disestablishment of the Church was a long process. An amusing incident hastened its end. Not until 1833 was the Church completely disestablished. The death-blow was given to it by the very weapon with which it had so long destroyed its enemies. By a curious irony of fate it perished by a law of its own making, a fact which all adherents of a union of Church and State would do well to remember before attempting to put their theories into practice. It seems that the Massachusetts Constitution gave to towns, and not to Churches, the right to elect the minister in the last resort. Now in many localities the old orthodox Church had become a minority as the result of the rapid increase of Unitarianism, though still containing control of affairs wherever the minister happened to be orthodox. But when a new election came off, the Unitarian majority of the town elected a minister of their own persuasion over the orthodox minority in actual control of the Church. The dispute was carried to the courts which naturally stood for the constitutional rights of the town. This was too much for the old theocracy, which saw itself hoist by its own petard. Finally, by 1833, the Church was disestablished. Titles were done away with, the voluntary system was introduced, and the town discharged from all participation in the management of Church affairs.

There are typical instances illustrating the tenacity of the old idea. It gave way slowly, grudgingly, with bad grace. Even now there are a few instances which survive, harmless, it is true, at the present moment, but yet existing. The state constitutions generally enforce religious liberty, although they differ very appreciably in their method of expressing the same. Nevertheless, there are exceptions. “In five states—Arkansas,

Mississippi, Texas, and the Carolinas—no person can hold office who denies the being of Almighty God or the existence of a Supreme Being. Arkansas also makes a denier of God incompetent as a witness. Pennsylvania and Tennessee restrict office to such as believe in God and in a future state of reward and punishment. Maryland requires this belief in a juror or witness, but for the office-holder demands only a belief in God." And yet by a curious inconsistency, two of these states (Mississippi and Tennessee) forbid all religious tests as qualifications for office.

To New Hampshire must be awarded the palm of intolerance. Up to 1881 the Bill of Rights contained this section: "Every denomination of *Protestant* Christians, demeaning themselves quietly and as good subjects of the State, shall be equally under the protection of the law." And the State yet continues to "authorize the *towns* to provide for the support of *Protestant* ministers." Repeated efforts have been made to do away with these last relics of intolerance, but to no avail. As late as 1889, they were retained with characteristic stubbornness, and for all we know, still remain. Of course the law is a dead letter in practice, but, nevertheless, the existence of a sentiment opposed, in theory, to its repeal, is a fact which may well call for some concern on the part of New Hampshire citizens who are not Protestant. Stranger things than the rehabilitation of supposedly defunct laws have happened in history.

There is, therefore, even at this late day, a difference in the amount of religious liberty guaranteed by the charters of the various states—a verbal difference because just now no state would think of applying any religious restrictions expressed by its Constitution. All, however, would seem to agree on the following points:

"1. No legislature can pass a law establishing religion or a church. To effect such a purpose a change in the Constitution would be required.

"2. No person can be compelled by law to attend any form of religious service; or

"3. To contribute to the support of any such service or Church.

"4. No restraint can be put by law on the free exercise of religion; or

"5. On the free expression and promulgation of religious belief. Provided always that this freedom shall not be construed as to excuse acts of licentiousness or to justify practices inconsistent with the peace and safety of the state" (op. cit., p. 520).

V. *Objections and Dangers*.—It must now be clear to the reader that religious toleration in America is an historical growth, the slow outcome of conditions peculiar to America. It is not the result of experiments based on an abstract theory, but a great fact adopted by a people tentatively, with almost unnecessary caution, after a long and unsuccessful trial of a union of Church and State. It was not forced upon them suddenly by a small band of doctrinaires before they were ready to grapple with the serious problems entailed by it. It needs to be looked on in this light in order to explain away some of its present inconsistencies and objections to it from a theoretical point of view. For there are inconsistencies and there are objections which cannot be brushed aside contemptuously. Our legislators can exclude the products of foreign countries by a tariff, but foreign ideas will always enter freely, will compete and force attention.

To all objections against separation of Church and State from a theoretical point of view, the serious American will answer that they do not touch the question vitally. Surely no one of judgment will question either the philosophical harmony and beauty of an ideal union of Church and State, or the fact that such unions have been beneficial under given conditions. The mere fact that all peoples believed in and practiced such a system up to within comparatively recent times, that even now many peoples do continue to live under it, is ample reason to restrain a sweeping condemnation of it. But theory very seldom disconcerts the American man. He accepts the opposite fact. He has lived under a different system for over a century, finds that it works very harmoniously despite an occasional hitch, and has firmly made up his mind to bitterly resent and unflinchingly oppose anything or anybody seeking to disturb the present state of affairs.

Objections touching upon facts require usually very detailed answers, even when the former presuppose ignorance.

A very common objection is that separation of Church from the State means persecution of the Church and atheism or indifference in the State. Such a conclusion is warranted neither by logic nor facts. The State declines to interfere in Church affairs, not because it is irreligious but because, from past experience, it has found out its incapacity to do so with good results to either, because the diversity of religious opinions renders union impracticable. The framers of the Constitution were, almost to a man, Christians, God-fearing and pious, after their own fashion. Infidelity or indifference were, with casual exceptions, abhorred by the leaders of the American Revolution. And, if facts alone can teach, then assuredly the sad condition of affairs in countries like France and Italy, where officially a union of Church and State exists, is eloquent enough to dispense with comment.

Indeed, many of our leading legists maintain that Christianity is "in a certain sense and for certain purposes . . . part of the law of the land." While this will allow for a diversity of opinion, all will accept without hesitation the tribute of De Tocqueville uttered sixty years ago: "There is no country in the whole world in which the Christian religion retains a greater influence over the souls of men than in America" (op. cit., p. 525). Certainly there is no country in the whole world where the true Church is more vigorous than, or even as vigorous as it is in the United States. Americans, therefore, indignantly repudiate the charge of irreligion, howevermuch there does exist among us a hopeless diversity of religious beliefs. This, by-the-way, is not of our own making, but a European inheritance.

This answer suggests the counter-objection of inconsistency. It is argued that if Christianity be the law of the land, what becomes of our boasted separation of Church and State. Add, moreover, our inconsistency in enacting laws for the observance of Sunday, the exemption of Church property from taxation, thanksgiving day proclamations, punishment of blasphemy, etc.

Now this is, indeed, a serious difficulty. The common answer to it is awkward. It says that the State looks upon the Church as a *social* institution, on religion of some sort as necessary to its own well-being, and so on. But whilst such a con-

nection between religion and well-being of society is undeniably necessary, this does not turn the point of the charge of inconsistency, for there is no such thing as church *in general* or religion *in general*, at least, in these days. There is not a single fundamental of any church which will be accepted by all others. What one church considers necessary to the well-being of society, another thinks evil. We have only to look upon the attitude of the various churches towards divorce. Thus the State is forced to adopt some principles of government which are denied by certain churches and accepted by others: this done, there is *ipso facto* a union of Church and State "in a certain sense." Thus a Jew can logically infer from the existence of our Sunday laws that this is a Christian State, and that he does not enjoy complete religious freedom if he is obliged to cease work on that day.

Again. Has not every persecutor that ever lived persecuted chiefly on the ground that the Church was a *social* institution? that heresy was a social menace, a political peril? Catholics were persecuted in England, the Huguenots in France because of political expediency. Old Rome slaughtered the Christians, because they were held enemies of the State.

Such answers, then, do not meet the difficulty. The only answer which seems reasonable is, strange to say, to admit the objection. We are inconsistent, but necessarily so. Only we do not admit that part of the objection which pre-supposes that Christianity is theoretically the law of the land. For, if Christianity be the law of the land, then what is Christianity? Is it Catholicity or Protestantism? and what is to prevent a Protestant majority from concluding that Protestantism is the law of the land? Hence, the use of the Protestant Bible and prayers in the public schools, and other conclusions. Our Puritan predecessors made Christianity the law of the land, and we Catholics know full well what that meant. Indeed, Christianity is no more the law of the land in theory than is Buddhism. But this is true, namely, that our laws are penetrated with the spirit of Christianity, that Americans, with some exceptions, are, as a nation, Christians, and live as Christians.

Now to the very *crux* of the difficulty. Are we inconsistent, *i. e.*, in passing Sunday Laws? It seems to me that we are, yet

we are forced to be so. The nation is, as a unit, Christian, and Christians as a unit observe Sunday. To make an exception for the sake of a few Jews is to expect too much from human nature, to push a theory to a ridiculous conclusion. As already emphasized, religious liberty in America is more of a fact than a theory. Were we dreamy doctrinaires, fierce apostles of a system, we should push separation of Church and State to some very unpleasant conclusions. But we are, above all, a practical people, inclined, therefore, to use with discretion, an institution that, for us at least, makes for peace and harmony. Our very inconsistency proves our good sense.

A last word as to the dangers ahead of us. Are there any? We think so, though at present they may seem distant and indistinct. The relations between Church and State are swaying in a delicate adjustment, which the slightest untoward movement can disturb. There are so many things, partly religious partly civil, that belong at once to both domains. The question of taxation for schools, appropriations for hospitals under religious control, appointments of army and navy chaplains—all these require infinite delicacy and tact in the handling. A blunder might at any time precipitate a crisis or establish precedents which would allow for the silent, insidious entrance of the principles of union of Church and State. Then, too, a heavy discount must ever be made for the tendency in human nature to grow tired of the same thing, no matter how excellent in itself, the yet greater tendency to grasp at power of any kind, the necessarily constantly increasing wealth of untaxed religious corporations tending to throw taxation upon civil entities, the presence in our midst of a not inconsiderable number of persons who secretly wish for a change of affairs because they are men of no country, the change in democratic ideas as the result of imperialistic expansion—these are but some of the grave dangers which every serious American must be aware of.

How shall we meet the problems of the future? With good sense, tact, charity, honesty, patience. Above all, with a knowledge of history. The writer can only repeat again, that separation of Church and State was not the outcome of a theory and does not exist as a theory. It is a fact now, and was the outcome of facts. It will be preserved chiefly by realizing this its

nature of fact. We do not need to repeat that the *theory* of a union of Church and State is as harmonious as the *theory* of their separation. It is only in the light of facts, of history, that the differences of merit appear. The prisons of the Inquisition, the fires of Smithfield, the massacre of St. Bartholomew, the blood of Catholic Irishmen flowing like water in the streets of Drogheda and Wexford, the unspeakable atrocities of the Thirty Years' War, the fanatic Titus Oates and Gordon riots, the witch-fires and duck-ponds of Salem, the Kultur-kampf, the present enslavement of the Church in European countries—this it is which makes an American love his country above all others as that wherein one may love God without hating his neighbor; these living historical memories alone will preserve him from any repetition of the errors of the dead and cruel past.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE, BALTIMORE, Md.

RELIGION AS A CREDIBLE DOCTRINE.

In a series of articles recently published in the *Fortnightly Review*, Mr. Mallock has undertaken to furnish us with an accurate estimate of the relative positions occupied by Religion and Science at the dawn of the twentieth century.¹ He proposes to investigate the intellectual accounts, both of theologians and of "leaders of science when they speak in the capacity of philosophers," and to formulate an intelligible statement of the respective assets and liabilities of the scientific philosopher who denies religion, and of the theologic philosopher who defends it. By religion Mr. Mallock means, not some particular system of worship, but simply Ethical Theism—"the essence, the vital epitome of religion" is comprised in the "doctrines of God, freedom and immortality," which are the basic ideas of Theistic Dualism. Three men, owing to their recognized ability as Theistic apologists, Father Gerard, Father Maher and Dr. W. G. Ward, have been singled out by Mr. Mallock, to bear the brunt of his attack on the Theistic position.

Opposed to Theistic Dualism is the doctrine of Evolutionary Monism, which Mr. Mallock is pleased to call scientific philosophy. This theory maintains that, "in the primitive nebula out of which the existing universe arose, was contained the potency of everything which the universe contains now, including life and all its phenomena—human, no less than animal reason. Besides the forces, qualities and materials contained in the primordial nebula, no other causes are required to explain the universe." Professor Haeckel is chosen by Mr. Mallock, as the ablest exponent of this theory.

In his rôle of intellectual accountant for Theistic Dualism and Evolutionary Monism, Mr. Mallock expects to show "that the scientific philosophers are correct in their methods and arguments—that the attempts of contemporary theologians to find flaws in the case of their opponents, or to convert the discoveries of science into proofs of their own theism, are exercises

¹ Since these pages were penned Mr. Mallock's articles have been embodied in a book entitled "Religion as a Credible Doctrine" (Macmillan).

of an ingenuity wholly and hopelessly misapplied." But he is not going to stop here. He proposes to establish that, in spite of the onslaught of science, we can find, in the fact of moral responsibility, sufficient ground for maintaining the doctrine of Theistic Dualism. To the former proposition, viz., that Evolutionary Monism is in accord with scientific knowledge, while Theistic Dualism is not, Mr. Mallock devotes most of his attention, and it is with this contention alone that we are concerned in the present paper.

It is to be deplored that at the very outset Mr. Mallock introduces into the discussion a source of interminable confusion. The terms, "man of science," "scientific philosopher," and "monist" are used interchangeably. The monistic doctrine of substance is declared to be a scientific theory. "Science," we are told, "leads us to a conception of matter or the universal substance nearly approaching to that of Spinoza." "Science is opposed to religion . . . as a monistic doctrine to a dualistic." The limits of confusion seem to be reached when Mr. Mallock repeatedly uses the term, "science" in two different significations in the same sentence. For example, he speaks of "Fr. Maher's endeavors to prove against science on *its* own ground, that man possesses a life independent of the life of the body." Here the term science obviously refers, in the first instance, to the speculations of evolutionary Monism; and secondly, to a systematized body of rigorously verified facts. This confusion of thought and terms pervades the whole series of articles, and has thoroughly obscured the original issue. Further, Mr. Mallock, instead of auditing the accounts of Monism and Dualism in the light of science, devotes his energies mainly to showing that Theists cannot prove the existence of an Ethical God solely from the data of physical science—a feat which no theist ever attempted to perform. In a word, Mr. Mallock begins by assuming that Evolutionary Monism is a scientific doctrine, and ends by elaborately proving that it is opposed to Theistic Dualism.

Mr. Mallock's statements of the doctrines of Monism and of Ethical Theism may be accepted as satisfactory. But in order to avoid Mr. Mallock's fatal confusion, we shall follow tradi-

tional usage in defining the domain of science as the "field of rigorously verified fact."

It is important to bear in mind that there is evolution and evolution. The word "evolution," as an *explanation* of the universe, expresses nothing until we know whether Theistic or Atheistic evolution is meant. With the former we have here no concern, for Mr. Mallock's evolution is the evolution of Professor Haeckel, who boasts that he has rendered the "God hypothesis" superfluous. The question then which confronts us is not whether evolution be scientific, but whether atheistic evolution be in accord with science.

In this paper it will conduce to clearness to discuss the problems at issue, not in the order which Mr. Mallock follows, but in the order which most naturally presents itself, viz., the origin of the universe; the genesis of life; the evolution of life-forms; the spirituality of the human soul, and finally, freedom of the will.

To begin with the beginning: the monistic concept of the origin of the universe is in irreconcilable opposition to the physical doctrine of entropy or the dissipation of energy—a doctrine our knowledge of which is due chiefly to Lord Kelvin. This law is stated by Professor Haeckel in these words: "As the mechanical energy of the universe is daily being transformed into heat, and this cannot be reconverted into mechanical energy, all difference of temperature must ultimately disappear, and the completely latent heat must be equally distributed through one inert mass of motionless matter." When Father Gerard pertinently points out that Monism is hopelessly at variance with this well authenticated conclusion of science, Mr. Mallock jauntily dismisses Father Gerard's strictures by asking in what way is the theory of entropy inconsistent with the doctrine of inorganic evolution. If Mr. Mallock refers to Theistic Evolution, the question is obviously irrelevant. But if he means to ask: How is the scientific doctrine of entropy opposed to Monistic Evolution, we shall let that "most eminent and thoughtful man of science," Professor Haeckel, supply the answer: "If the theory of entropy were true," says Professor Haeckel, "we should have a beginning corresponding to this assumed end of the world. Both ideas are quite untenable in the light of our monistic and consistent theory of the eternal

cosmogenetic process.”¹ In other words, Professor Haeckel rejects an authoritative conclusion of physical science because it contradicts Professor Haeckel’s philosophical speculations. This method of procedure is thoroughly characteristic of the whole monistic argument, and the denial of the doctrine of entropy is by no means the only example we shall see of the facility with which monists reject the most thoroughly established facts which happen to be out of harmony with their “enlarged cosmological perspective.”

The next point to be discussed is the question of the genesis of life. Here we shall find Evolutionary Monism again discredited by physical science. The fundamental proposition of evolutionary philosophy, Professor Huxley tells us, is, “that the whole world, living and non-living, is the result of *mutual interaction*, according to definite laws, of the powers possessed by the molecules of which the primitive nebosity was composed.”² This proposition, which is fundamental with evolutionary Monists, is utterly unscientific. Professor Tait only voices the verdict of all sane science when he declares: “To say that even the lowest form of life can be fully explained on physical principles alone, *i. e., by the mere relations, motions and interactions* of portions of inanimate matter, is simply unscientific. There is absolutely nothing known in physical science which can lend the slightest support to such an idea.”³ No scientist of note would to-day maintain that there is the slightest shred of experimental evidence supporting the doctrine of abiogenesis.

Now this doctrine of abiogenesis is, as we have been repeatedly told, a cardinal principle with the Monist. Another principle not less essential to the Monist is that all knowledge is worthless which is not based on experience. Still he continues to uphold abiogenesis in spite of the fact that all trustworthy experience tells against it. Contradicted by all science worthy of the name, he continues to proclaim abiogenesis a philosophical necessity:⁴ either, he says, spontaneous generation took

¹ “Riddle of the Universe,” p. 247.

² On the Reception of the Origin of Species, “Life of C. Darwin,” p. 201.

³ *Contemporary Review*, January, 1878.

⁴ In marked contrast to this unscientific frame of mind is the attitude of Professor Brooks. Speaking of life, he says: “While we know nothing of its

place ages ago, or else there is some power distinct from the forces of inorganic nature, which produced life on the earth. But the latter supposition he holds to be inadmissible and absurd, as is proven by a mere reference to "our monistic cosmological perspective." Surely, a system that employs this kind of reasoning has forfeited all claims to be considered either scientific or philosophic.

In his eagerness to eliminate this vital discrepancy between monism and science, Mr. Mallock resorts to very peculiar tactics. Instead of meeting the dualist argument that there is demonstrably involved in all organic life a principle which is absent from inorganic matter, he conveniently denies that the problem of the origin of life has any bearing on the truth of Ethical Theism: "As far as the practical controversy between religion and science is concerned, the issue here raised is altogether illusory." But, if science disproves a fundamental tenet of Monism it is difficult to understand Mr. Mallock's assertion that "Science is opposed to religion as a monistic doctrine to a dualistic." If, as he says, the conflict between science and religion is resolvable into a conflict between monism and dualism, then it would seem that a disproof of monism in a basic doctrine should bear very directly on the "practical controversy between religion and science." What Mr. Mallock's contention here amounts to is simply this: the disproof of monism does not establish the existence of an ethical God. To disprove abiogenesis, he explains, is merely to establish a dualism between fermented liquor and unfermented; between beer and water. "How far," he asks, "should we be on the road to vindicating religion with God for one of our terms and beer or *vin ordinaire* for the other?" This is really unworthy of Mr. Mallock. He rejects an argument because it fails to prove what it was never intended to prove. He seems to have forgotten that, as he himself has already pointed out, the theistic apologists are here trying to establish the existence not of an ethical God, but of a living Creator. "The real question at issue," says Father Dris-

nature or origin and must guard against any unproved assumption, there seem from the present standpoint to be insuperable objections to the view that this agency is either matter or energy." "We are told that the belief that it has at some time arisen from the properties of inorganic matter is a logical necessity, but the only logical necessity is that where our knowledge ends we should confess our ignorance." *Science*, April 5, 1895.

coll, as quoted by Mr. Mallock, "is the existence of a living Creator"; and Mr. Mallock adds, "Father Maher says precisely the same thing."

From the problem of the origin of life, we pass on to the question of the evolution of living beings. "Undoubtedly," says Father Gerard, to whom Mr. Mallock now directs his attention, "we find that the history of life on earth has been a history of evolution—that is to say the scheme of vegetable and animal life as we know it has been gradually unfolded in a progression of types from lower to higher, the same general lines of structure being elaborated to greater and greater perfection." For the explanation of this process of evolution there are two hypotheses and only two in the field. Of these one is intelligent design manifested in creation. The other is natural selection operating through countless ages of the past. The former is the explanation offered by Theistic Dualism. The latter is the theory of Evolutionary Monism. Professor Haeckel calls the struggle for life "the great selective divinity by which a purely natural choice without preconceived design creates new forms, just as selective man creates new types by an artificial choice with definite design." And the most glorious achievement of the Darwinian theory of natural selection, he assures us, is that it gave us the solution of the great philosophical problem, how can purposive contrivances be produced by merely mechanical processes without design? The Darwinian theory of natural selection is, then, the basis of the monistic concept of the Universe. But here again scientific investigation has been unfavorable to such a conception. "Serious objections have presented themselves," as Father Gerard points out, "difficulties have accumulated, till now as we have been told, the natural selection theory has sunk beneath the rank even of an hypothesis." This statement Mr. Mallock challenges with a direct denial: "Whether the theory of natural selection be a true theory or not, the scientific world of to-day have not agreed to abandon it." In considering this assertion we should remember that Darwinian natural selection is a theory explaining purposive adaptations on purely mechanical grounds, and that in a teleological view of evolution natural selection is simply a factor supporting or accelerating the process. Now, Mr. Mal-

lock's statement that the purely mechanical theory of natural selection is still in repute among scientists, is to say the least, interesting. We might quote indefinitely the views of individual scientists to the contrary, were it not rendered unnecessary by the appearance of a recent publication of high authority. We refer to the work by Dr. E. Dennert, entitled, "*Vom Sterbelager des Darwinismus.*" After quoting the views of dozens of naturalists, zoologists, biologists, who are opposed to the Darwinian philosophy, Dr. Dennert, speaking of the actual status of the present controversy, has this to say: "It cannot be denied that Darwinism, in the sense of natural selection by means of the struggle for existence, is being crowded to the wall all along the line. The bulk of modern scientists no longer recognizes it, and those who have not yet discarded it, at any rate regard it as of subordinate importance. In place of this, older views have again come into acceptance, which do not deny development, but maintain that this was not purely a mechanical process. . . . A survey of the field shows that Darwinism in its old form is becoming a matter of history, and that we are actually witnessing its death struggle." We cannot be expected to admit as ultimate the mechanical explanation of the universe when the theory on which it is based is openly or tacitly rejected by men of science as insufficient. The structure of Evolutionary Monism indeed, remains, but its scientific foundation is admittedly gone. "What is it, then," Father Gerard may well ask, "but a mere castle in the air?"

After a vain chase from star-dust to animal sentience in search of a solitary instance in which science either sustains Evolutionary Monism or contradicts Theistic Dualism, Mr. Mallock brings the religious apologist up short with the thesis: "The religious doctrine of man stands or falls . . . with the establishment of a difference between animal life and human." Here two questions are involved, viz: the spirituality of the human soul and the freedom of the will. As the most capable exponent of the former doctrine, Father Maher is singled out for attack; for a similar reason Dr. W. G. Ward is taken to task on the latter.

The traditional scholastic arguments for the spirituality of the soul are presented by Father Maher with unusual clearness.

The human soul, he tells us, exercises activities which transcend the powers of any agent intrinsically dependent on matter. A most obvious example of such an activity is the intellectual act of apprehending abstract, universal and necessary truths, or the act of perceiving rational relations between ideas, and the logical sequence of conclusions from premises. Moreover, the reflex operation exhibited in self-consciousness cannot be the act of a faculty essentially dependent on a corporeal agent. The act of reflexion is in absolute contradiction with the essential nature of matter. The intellectual operations of the soul are thus seen to be independent of matter. And as we may logically argue from the nature of the activity to the nature of the agent, we conclude that the soul, as the source of spiritual activities, must also be spiritual.

Now what is the value of all these arguments? "I shall point out," says Mr. Mallock, "that they are all of them equally inconclusive: that they ignore facts which are obvious, assume facts which are unprovable—and that in a still more striking manner, the more important of them contradict each other." "In the first place," continues Mr. Mallock, "Father Maher's entire appeal is an appeal to the imagination. It amounts to assuming that the unimaginable cannot exist." And as Father Maher himself sees, when it is to his interest, "Imagination is not the test of possibility." Mr. Mallock's explanation of this bit of criticism is hopelessly unintelligible, so entirely has he misunderstood Father Maher's position. To quote his own words: "The unique and unimaginable nature of the phenomena presented by consciousness as associated with matter, is seen and acknowledged by everybody as fully as it is by Father Maher: but he, like everybody else, admits this association is a fact; and the fact that consciousness is associated with matter at all is just as difficult to imagine, and is just as contrary to the analogy of all other phenomena, as would be the fact that consciousness could exist apart from it or that it could not." This is all quite true and at the same time quite irrelevant. There is here no question of imaginability. All the phenomena under consideration are unimaginable. The problem is one of metaphysics, and amounts to this: Find a sufficient cause for the intellectual activities of man. A careful analysis of the

phenomena involved shows that no material organ can possibly be such a cause as is required. That spiritual operations should have their source in a material substance is not only unimaginable, but, in the strictest sense, inconceivable.

Mr. Mallock's whole objection comes from supposing that Father Maher argues from the simplicity, *i. e.*, quantitative nonextension, of the soul, to its spirituality, *i. e.*, independence of matter. That this is his view of his opponent's position is evidenced from the dilemma in which he fancies Father Maher has placed himself. "If the non-spatial intellect must be essentially independent of the spatial brain, why is the non-spatial consciousness of the brute not likewise essentially independent of its material organ?" In each case the chasm between matter and consciousness is for the imagination and the intellect equally impassable." "The whole argument from the contrariety between conscious life and matter is therefore wholly valueless. It either shows that animals are immortal, which Father Maher denies; or it does nothing to show that man is." With most perverse ingenuity, Mr. Mallock has here introduced a source of confusion which has concealed from him the weakness of his own objection. When this confusion is removed the solution of his dilemma will neither be difficult nor far to seek. His entire difficulty arises from a failure to distinguish between the simplicity and the spirituality of the soul, and between the proofs by which each is established. Yet this elementary distinction is indicated by Father Maher with the greatest precision: "By saying a substance is simple we mean that it is not the resultant or product of separate factors or parts. By affirming that it is spiritual we signify that in its existence, and to some extent in its operations, it is independent of matter. The principle of life in the lower animal was held by the schoolmen to be, in this sense, an example of a simple principle which is nevertheless not spiritual since it is altogether dependent on the organism, or as they said, 'completely immersed in matter.'"¹

From the non-extended character of sentiency, whether in man or animals, nothing can be established as regards the soul except its simplicity. And no scholastic, least of all Father

¹ "Psychology," p. 469.

Maher, ever dreamed of proving the spirituality of the soul from this source. If the simple soul be essentially independent of matter it is said to be spiritual; if it depends on matter for its existence it is said to be non-spiritual or material. Now the only way in which we can judge whether the soul is essentially independent of matter or not, is by a study of its operations. If it puts forth activities which are entirely in accord with the activities, *i. e.*, properties, of matter, we have no reason to believe that it is essentially independent of matter. But if, on the other hand, its operations transcend the power of a material organ and radically contradict every known property of matter, we are justified in holding it to be essentially independent of matter, *i. e.*, spiritual. With the mere explanation of this distinction Mr. Mallock's objections become not so much irrelevant as meaningless.

We scarcely need refer to Mr. Mallock's attempt to prove the spirituality of the brute soul. If he were to show that the brute exercises spiritual activities, *e. g.*, that the brute can apprehend necessary truths, or is capable of self-consciousness, he would be entitled to conclude that the brute soul is spiritual. But in this matter his reasoning is not in harmony with the best psychological thought of the day. The verdict of the most eminent psychologists is that all the actions of even the higher animals can be explained by assuming them to be endowed with powers analogous to man's sense faculties.¹ And from the operations of man's sense faculties we could never deduce the spirituality of man's soul. Without entering into Mr. Mallock's arguments here, it is sufficient to observe that they are completely beside the question. Even if he were to succeed in establishing his point, it would in no way detract from the theistic argument. The nature of the human soul is deduced from its operations, and its spirituality is conclusively established independently of all speculation as to the nature of the animal soul.

¹ Wundt's testimony may be taken as typical; "The closer analysis of the so-called manifestations of intelligence among animals shows, however, that they are in all cases fully explicable as simple sensible recognitions and associations, and that they lack the characteristics belonging to concepts proper and to logical operations." "Outlines of Psychology," p. 314.

Confident that he has completely demolished Father Maher's arguments of the spirituality of the human soul, Mr. Mallock passes on to the problem of free will. Here, if anywhere, Mr. Mallock is called upon to show most clearly the harmony of evolutionary monism with the facts of positive knowledge, for on this point the universal conviction of mankind absolutely contradicts the fundamental principle of the monistic philosophy. Before we can reasonably be asked to reject this undeniable conviction of the human race—and this is surely "a fact of positive knowledge"—reasons more substantial must be advanced than the mere assertion that Professor Haeckel finds no place for the fact of freedom in his "enlarged cosmological perspective."

"The main grounds," says Mr. Mallock, "on which modern science (sc. monistic philosophy) contends that free will is impossible," are three. First: "The general argument from psychology may be summed up thus: In the absence of motive there can be no act of the will at all. When motives are present will is always determined by the strongest." Second: "Since every act of the will, every motive, feeling or desire has its physical equivalent in some movement or condition of the brain, all mental processes must follow the same laws as those which prevail through the whole physical universe." Third: "This argument comprises a mass of facts which show how the qualities of the individual organism depend on parentage, physical health, climate, and similar circumstances, so that whilst it is the organism which determines the character and will of the individual, it is a multitude of external causes that determine the character of the organism." Let us examine these arguments briefly: The last directly involves a *petitio principii*. It assumes that the organism necessarily determines the character and the will. This is the point at issue. The scientific facts, which show that the qualities of the individual organism depend on heredity and environment, are recognized by the defender of free will quite as fully as by the determinist, but the former utterly repudiates the assumption that the qualities of the organism necessarily determine either character or will. Character, he maintains, is to a great extent, moulded by the will, whilst the will, being the activity of a free cause, is self-deter-

mining. This position he defends by an appeal to experience. As regards the physical sciences, there is not, and by the very nature of the case cannot be, a shred of physical or physiological evidence forthcoming to support the assumption of the determinist. Physiology, we are told by the most eminent physiological psychologists, neither disproves nor verifies the postulate of the free will. Consequently, this postulate must be raised and discussed on other grounds—the problem of the free will belongs to the domain of rational psychology.

The second argument involves a confusion of the law of causation with the uniformity of the laws of nature. We need not go into this question because Mr. Mallock himself freely confesses that the argument is worthless. He tells us: “If we allow ourselves to assume that the brain is influenced by some hyper-physical cause . . . with which it is associated, the hypothesis of this free force does not necessarily contradict the scientific doctrine of the uniformity of the physical universe.” Precisely, and no theist ever attempted to explain the freedom of the will on any other assumption than that man is endowed with a hyper-physical soul—the existence of which we have already seen, has been established by incontestable arguments.

We come finally to the consideration of the problem of Free-will from the standpoint of rational psychology. On this point Mr. Mallock directs his attack against Dr. W. G. Ward, who, on the admission of John Stuart Mill, was “one of the clearest and most logical of the English dialecticians of his time.” In his disproof of Determinism Dr. Ward, with characteristic clearness, goes directly to the point at issue. He begins with the fact, admitted by everyone, that the spontaneous and unforced impulse of the will is determined by character and circumstances. “A man’s spontaneous impulse” he says, “is infallibly and inevitably determined by his entire circumstances external and internal, of the moment.” Thus far Dr. Ward and the Determinist agree. But now the question arises: Does preponderating spontaneous impulse always and *necessarily* issue in accordant action? This is the critical point. The answer given to the question must settle the controversy between Determinists and Libertarians. The Determinist must answer the ques-

tion in the affirmative. Dr. Ward rejoins with repeated and emphatic denial. "I am able," he says, "to resist this spontaneous impulse by my soul's intrinsic strength. . . . Consciousness attests unmistakably that I have the power of resisting my preponderating spontaneous impulse. . . . It is a matter of unmistakable certainty that at this moment the spontaneous *impulse* of my will is in one direction and the *act* of my will is in the opposite direction"—"It is an undeniable fact of experience that at certain periods I pursue a course of conduct *divergent* from that prompted by my will's spontaneous impulse. It is most clear, then, that at these particular periods, my will is not *infallibly* determined by the preponderating influences or attractions of the moment. In other words, the phenomena of those periods make it irrefragably certain that the doctrine of determinism is false."¹

"This argument," says Mr. Mallock, "amounts to nothing. For," he continues, "Dr. Ward (1) instead of attempting to find any internal flaw" in the determinist arguments, "admits that so far as a large part of human life is concerned, they are correct, irrefragable and conclusive." (2) "In other words, Dr. Ward frankly admits that most of the actions of all of us are as completely determined and necessary as the most thorough-going determinist could maintain them to be." (3) "Instead of doing anything to reconcile" free-will with determinism, "he contents himself with admitting that the mysterious action of the former extends over a smaller domain of human conduct than most of the advocates of free-will suppose, and that the domain of the necessary or the determined is very considerably larger." (4) "Free-will," according to his own admission, "is essentially will without motive. Thus an event or process which in the larger part of human conduct, his analysis shows to be impossible and even unthinkable, is in the smaller part, not only not impossible, but of constant occurrence." Hence concludes Mr. Mallock, "the sole result at which Dr. Ward arrives is not even an apparent re-conciliation of free will with Determinism. He leaves free will, on one hand, as unthinkable and unintelligible as he finds it: he leaves Determinism on the other, with its foundation unshaken, untouched."

¹ "Philosophy of Theism," Vol. II, p. 16.

What is to be said of Mr. Mallock's criticism? Merely this, that the position ascribed to Dr. Ward in the four passages just quoted—passages which form the basis of Mr. Mallock's criticism—is fundamentally different from Dr. Ward's actual position as set forth in his published essays. (1) We read with amazement, "Dr. Ward did not attempt to find an internal flaw in the determinist arguments." Dr. Ward resolves the discussion into an appeal to facts of experience and then thoroughly establishes that such facts make "it irrefragably certain that Determinism is false." To give irrefragable proof that a doctrine is false is surely to find an internal flaw in it. (2) "Dr. Ward frankly admits that most of the actions of us all are as completely determined and necessary as the most thoroughgoing Determinist could maintain them to be." There is not so much as a single passage in Dr. Ward's works which, if taken with the context, would justify this assertion. On the contrary, Dr. Ward repeatedly states: "that man is free during pretty nearly the whole of his waking life." This statement is the thesis of an essay of over seventy-five pages.¹ Moreover, he thoroughly concurs with Father Gury in the assertion that, man, during his earthly course, *while sui compos, never acts under necessity*. (3) "Dr. Ward contents himself with admitting that the mysterious action of freewill extends over a smaller domain of human conduct than most of the advocates of free-will suppose." Dr. Ward admits nothing of the sort. "The tenet . . . that my will is only free at those particular moments, when, after expressly debating and consulting with myself as to the choice I shall make between two or more competing alternatives, I make my definite resolve accordingly; this tenet, held by most non-Catholic and many Catholic Libertarians—we cannot but regard as erring gravely against reason, against sound morality and against Catholic Theology." "We maintain that when (this tenet) is embodied in concrete fact and translated into everyday practice, the very doctrine of Determinism is less repulsive to the common sense and the common voice of mankind than is (this)—doctrine on the limits of Freewill." "I am my own master and responsible for my course of action during pretty near the whole of my waking

¹ "Philosophy of Theism," 18th Essay.

life." (4) Finally, Mr. Mallock tells us: "Freewill, according to Dr. Ward's admission, is essentially will without motive." Mr. Mallock here means that the anti-impulsive resolve is unmotived. This is sheer nonsense. It is only in relation to the anti-impulsive resolve that Dr. Ward would have us speak of "motives" at all. The influence of the spontaneous impulse is an "attraction." "But a 'motive' is a thought of such and such an end which the will, by its own active resolve, chooses to pursue." "What are the motives," asks Dr. Ward, "which induce a man to resist his spontaneous impulse?" And he answers: "There are two which are adequate to the purpose. First there is my resolve of doing what is right: and secondly, my desire of promoting my permanent happiness in the next world, or even in this." So much for Mr. Mallock's statements individually. Taken collectively they are contradicted by the "common axiom of theologians," which is also fundamental with Dr. Ward, viz: "that no object necessitates the human will, except only God, as seen face to face in heaven."¹

Mr. Mallock's criticism of the position of "one of the clearest and most logical English dialecticians," based as it is on an utter misrepresentation of that philosopher's position, amounts to nothing more or less than a disgraceful caricature.

We have reached the end of Mr. Mallock's destructive (!) criticism of our Catholic apologists. We have seen that science in the sense of "rigorously verified fact" repudiates Evolutionary Monism at every step, and is throughout in harmony with the doctrine of Theism. To the objections already urged against Monistic philosophy it is needless to add the contradiction in which, as Mr. Mallock himself points out, it is involved by its postulate of a continuous ether. Professor Haeckel's theory, therefore, of the "eternal cosmogenetic process" is from every point of view thoroughly unscientific, and we may dismiss its claim to be even a consistent system of philosophy with the words of von Hartmann; "Haeckel is, therefore, an ontological pluralist, since he conceives nature as a plurality of separate substances (atoms): a metaphysical dualist, since he assumes two metaphysical principles (force and matter) in every single substance: a phenomenal dualist, since he recog-

¹ "Philosophy of Theism," Vol. II, p. 317.

nizes two different fields of phenomena (external mechanical occurrence and internal sensation and will): a hylozoist, since he ascribes life and soul to every part of matter: a philosopher of identity, since he regards one and the same kind of substances as the ground of both fields of phenomena: a cosmologic monist, since he denies the teleological uniformity in nature and admits only causal law; and a mechanist, since he regards all causal processes as mechanical processes of material particles."¹

Mr. Mallock's latest excursion into the field of philosophy must come as a surprise and a disappointment to those who are familiar with the thoughtful and critical tone of most of his other writings. It is hard to understand how a man of Mr. Mallock's intellectual acumen could regard the dogmatic pronouncements of Professor Haeckel as the highest achievements of science. Among the scholars of the day Professor Haeckel stands discredited as a man of science. Professor Paulsen has recently stigmatized as a disgrace to German scholarship, the very work of Haeckel's from which Mr. Mallock has drawn so extensively and so unquestioningly. And still more recently, Professor Rüttemeyer, the distinguished zoölogist, has openly accused Mr. Mallock's "eminent and thoughtful man of science" of "playing with the public and the natural sciences." That Mr. Mallock should regard Professor Haeckel's theorizing seriously, is to be wondered at; that he should confound such reckless speculation with science is still more amazing.

But if his rash espousal of Professor Haeckel's views is unworthy of Mr. Mallock's prestige as an intellectual accountant, his unfair treatment of theistic apologists is no less deserving of censure. In spite of his repeated assurance that all their arguments amount to nothing a cursory perusal of their works shows that Mr. Mallock has in every case failed to understand the position he attacks. This misconception not only invalidates his criticism of Father Gerard and Father Maher, but in the case of Dr. Ward, exposes Mr. Mallock to the further charge of culpable negligence.

EDWIN V. O'HARA.

ACADEMY OF APOLOGETICS,
ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

¹ "Geschichte der Metaphysik," Vol. II, p. 456.

VATICAN SYRIAC MSS.: OLD AND NEW PRESS-MARKS.¹

When Joseph Simon Assemani began his great work, the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, the Syriac MSS. of the Vatican Library formed nine separate collections.

1. The old Vatican Collection, which had been catalogued by Abraham Echellensis. It included MSS. in the Syriac language only;² the Karšūnī MSS., that is, those written in Arabic with Syriac characters, had been added to the Arabic Collection.³ This old Vatican Collection contained 49 MSS.

2. The Nitrian Collection, brought from the Syrian monastery of St. Mary in the desert of Nitria in Egypt. This collection had been purchased in 1707 for Pope Clement XI by Elias Assemani, a cousin of J. S. Assemani. It included 34 MSS., one of which (no. XX) in Karšūnī.

3. The Echellensis Collection which had been bought by Pope Clement XI. It was made up of the private collection of Abraham Echellensis and of that of his successor, Faustus Naironi. It contained 64 MSS., 20 of which were in Syriac.

4. The Amida Collection, so called because it came from the private library of the Chaldean patriarch Joseph I, a native of Amida (Diarbekir), who died at Rome in 1713. 18 of its 20 MSS. were in Syriac.

5. The Beroe Collection, gathered by Gabriel Eva, a Maronite monk of the Order of St. Anthony, during his sojourn (1718–21) at Aleppo (the ancient Beroe) whither he had been sent by Clement XI to settle certain disputes among the Maronites of that region. This collection numbered only 13 MSS., among which were 9 Syriac MSS.

6. The Assemani Collection, acquired by J. S. Assemani himself, during a voyage to the East (1715–17) undertaken at

¹ Digest of an article written by Dr. Hyvernât in the *Annales de Saint Louis des Français* for October, 1902, under the title "Concordances des côtes des anciens fonds et du fonds actuel syriaques de la Vaticane."

² Some of these MSS. had been bought by the authorities of the Vatican Library; the others had been composed and written by the "Scriptores" themselves.

³ When the Assemanis undertook a new classification of the Vatican MSS., the Karšūnī MSS., fifteen in number, were transferred to the Syriac Collection.

the request of Clement XI. It contained 45 Syriac MSS. Some of these were brought from the Monastery of St. Mary in Nitria, 12 from the Convent of Saidnaia near Damascus, and the majority of them from Aleppo and Mount Lebanon.¹

7. The Scandar Collection brought from the East for Pope Innocent XIII, by the Maronite Andrew Scandar, professor of Arabic at the Roman Sapienza. It numbered 61 MSS., distributed as follows: 35 Syriac (I-XXXV), 19 Arabic (XXXVI-LIV), 6 Greek (LV-LX), and one Hebrew (LXI).

8. The Carafa Collection, formed with the help of Eastern missionaries by Peter Aloysius Carafa, Archbishop of Larissa and Secretary to the Propaganda. He gave it to Clement XI for the Vatican Library. This collection which was added to that of Andrew Scandar contained 5 Syriac MSS. (LXII-LXVI), 6 Arabic MSS. (LXVII-LXXII), and 4 Greek MSS. (LXXIII-LXXVI).

9. The Propaganda Collection, acquired by the authorities of the Congregation P. F. and transferred by them to the Vatican Library in 1723 together with other Oriental Collections. This Collection numbered 16 Syriac MSS.

Abraham Echellensis wrote a brief catalogue of the Old Vatican Collection under the title "*Index librorum (manuscriptorum) Chaldaicorum et Syriacorum, Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ, 12 junii 1660.*" He also catalogued the Arabic MSS. He died in 1664. His work was continued by John Matthew Naironi, who added the other Oriental MSS. to the Arabic Collection and placed at the head of the Syriac MSS. the only Samaritan MS. then at the Vatican. Naironi's Catalogue,² still unpublished, is to be found, together with the "*Index*" of Echellensis, in the reading room of the Vatican Library. The Index con-

¹ During this same voyage J. S. Assemani collected a certain number of Coptic and Arabic MSS. Among the latter were 11 Karšūnī MSS., which, like those of the old Arabic Collection, were classed with the Syriac MSS. For a description of these Karšūnī MSS., see "*Index Codicum*" of the "*Bibliotheca Orientalis*," I, p. 619.

² Its complete title is: *Catalogus Codicum MSS. linguarum Orientalium Vaticanæ Bibliothecæ nempe Samaritanæ, Chaldaicæ, etc. S. D. N. Innocentio XI P. M. Em. et Rev. Laurentio Brancato de Lauræa S. R. E. Card. Biblioth. Illustriss. D. Emanuele a Schelstrate ejusdem Bibliothecæ Custode. Inceptus ab Abrahamo Echellense A. D. MDCLX et absolutus a Io. Matthæo Nairono Banesio Maronitis in eadem Bibliotheca Scriptoribus A. D. MDCLXXXVI.*

tains only 47 numbers; the Catalogue 48. To these a 49th number was added later.

The remaining eight collections were catalogued and described briefly by J. S. Assemani in his "*Bibliotheca Orientalis*."¹ Later Stephen Evodius Assemani, in collaboration with Joseph Simon Assemani, his uncle, undertook a systematic and detailed catalogue of all the Oriental MSS. in the Vatican Library.² The separate collections in each language were merged into one, and the MSS. were classified according to their contents, no account being made of the particular collection to which they belonged originally. Thus the nine Syriac Collections, of which we spoke above, were thrown together into one, and their MSS. were designated by new numbers. Such a procedure would have caused no great inconvenience, had the authors of the Catalogue given a concordance of the numbers of the MSS. in the old collections with the numbers in the new collection they had formed. But, instead of this, they simply noted, at the beginning of the description of each MS., the number which the MS. bore originally. Thus we can refer from the Catalogue to the "*Index Codicum*" of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, but not vice versa; in other words, the Catalogue is of no practical use to the readers of the *Bibliotheca*. Besides, the Catalogue of the Assemanis is exceedingly rare. Hardly was the edition finished when it was almost entirely destroyed by fire. Only a few copies remain, so that, to-day, the "*Index Codicum*" of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* is practically the only source of information regarding the contents of the Syriac MSS. of the Vatican. Unfortunately, the numbers of the MSS.

¹ *Bibliotheca Orientalis Clementino-Vaticana in qua manuscripti Codices syriaci, arabici . . . Romae, 1721-1728, fol., 3 tomes in 4 vols.*

See tome I. "*Index Codicum Manuscriptorum quos Clemens XI Pont. Max Bibliothecæ Vaticanæ addixit.*" Nitrian Coll., p. 561; Echellensis Coll., p. 573; Amida Coll., p. 581; Beroe Coll., p. 585; and Assemani Coll., p. 606; tome II. "*Index Codicum*" . . . as above, "una cum iis quos Sanctissimus Pater Innocentius XIII in eandem Bibliothecam inferre jussit," Scandar Coll., p. 486, Carafa Coll., p. 517; tome III. "*Codices Manuscripti Syriaci, Coptici, Arabici et Armenici typis impressi ad sacram Congregationem de Propaganda Fide ex Oriente transmissi ejusdemque decreto in Bibliothecam Vaticanam illati, etc.*" Propaganda Coll., p. 635.

² *Bibliotheca Apostolica Vaticana Codicum manuscriptorum Catalogus in tres partes distributus, etc., Primæ Partis, tomus I (Hebrew MSS.), tomus II et III (Syriac MSS.) Romæ, 1757-1759.*

in this "Index" do not correspond with their numbers in the new classification, the only one now in use.

We have thought that it would be a welcome help to the ever increasing number of Syriac students to publish the two following Concordances: the first, of the old numbers with the new; the second, of the new numbers with the old. By means of the first, the reader of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* will know the number which the MS. he desires to consult bears in the new classification; by means of the second, those who cannot consult the Catalogue of the two Assemanis will be able to use the "Index Codicum" in its stead.

Let us add a few words of explanation for the right understanding and use of these two Concordances. In the first Concordance, after the old Vatican and Assemani Collections, the numbers of the Karšūnī MSS., of which we spoke above, are given under the heading "Supplement." A No. XIIbis has been added to the Propaganda Collection, and a No. XLVI to the Collection of Assemani. Although these two MSS. are noticed neither in the *Codices Manuscripti* of the third tome, nor in the "Index Codicum" of the first tome, of the *Bibliotheca Orientalis*, they are, nevertheless, so numbered in the Catalogue. It must be remarked that Nos. XLI, XLIII, and XLV of the old Vatican Collection, No. XII of the Beroe Collection, and Nos. XIII and XIV of the Amida Collection, have no corresponding numbers in the second Concordance. As there is no trace of these MSS. in the catalogue, their disappearance must go back to an early date. It is also to be noted that in the second Concordance MSS. IX, X, XI of the Propaganda Collection are registered under a single MS. in three volumes. The total number of the MSS. of the old Syriac Collections is thus reduced from 231 to 225. By adding to them the 26 MSS. taken from the old Arabic Collections, we get the sum total of 251 MSS. Yet the second Concordance has 256 numbers. This is owing to the fact that the authors of the Catalogue added 4 MSS. (181, 189, 191, 195) which had found their way into the Vatican Library after the formation of the early collections, and a fifth MS. (230), the origin of which is not given. These five MSS. are designated by "Add." The letter "A" has been written after the numbers of the Karšūnī MSS. taken from the

old Arabic Collections. The sigla "Vat." or "Vatic." followed by Roman numerals, refer to the MSS. of the old Vatican Collection; these same sigla, followed by Arabic numerals, designate the MSS. in the new classification. The two Concordances cover only the Vatican MSS. mentioned in the Bibliotheca Orientalis and in the Catalogue of Assemani. Since then the number of Syriac MSS. of the Vatican Library has been almost doubled by the addition of Assemani's own Collection and that of the Borgian Museum.

I.

CONCORDANCE OF THE OLD NUMBERS WITH THE NEW.

1° *Old Vatican Collection.*

VATIC. I	= VATIC. 7	VATIC. XXVI	= VATIC. 88
" II	= " 2	" XXVII	= " 89
" III	= " 3	" XXVIII	= " 188
" IV	= " 5	" XXIX	= " 28
" V	= " 4	" XXX	= " 36
" VI	= " 10	" XXXI	= " 148
" VII	= " 9	" XXXII	= " 186
" VIII	= " 15	" XXXIII	= " 193
" IX	= " 17	" XXXIV	= " 18
" X	= " 16	" XXXV	= " 95
" XI	= " 19	" XXXVI	= " 35
" XII	= " 22	" XXXVII	= " 158
" XIII	= " 154	" XXXVIII	= " 6
" XIV	= " 128	" XXXIX	= " 107
" XV	= " 27	" XL	= " 145
" XVI	= " 65	" XLI	= " 226
" XVII	= " 66	" XLII	= " 190
" XVIII	= " 45	" XLIII	= " 57
" XIX	= " 46	" XLIV	= " 108
" XX	= " 86	" XLV	= " 85
" XXI	= " 68	" XLVI	= " 228
" XXII	= " 69	" XLVII	
" XXIII	= " 67	" XLVIII	
" XXIV	= " 87	" XLIX	
" XXV	= " 62		

Supplement.

VATIC. III (A)	= VAt. 98	VATIC. CXIV (A)	= VAt. 205
" X (A)	= " 197	" CXXXIII(A)	= " 212
" XVII (A)	= " 203	" CXLI (A)	= " 213
" XLI (A)	= " 211	" CL (A)	= " 99
" XLIX (A)	= " 229	" CLI (A)	= " 214
" LII (A)	= " 225	" CLXVIII(A)	= " 208
" LV (A)	= " 199	" CLXXXII(A)	= " 227
" LIX (A)	= " 72		

2° Nitrian Collection.

NITR. I	= VAt. 12	NITR. XVIII	= VAt. 122
" II	= " 13	" XIX	= " 123
" III	= " 25	" XX	= " 198
" IV	= " 26	" XXI	= " 124
" V	= " 117	" XXII	= " 125
" VI	= " 110	" XXIII	= " 254
" VII	= " 111	" XXIV	= " 106
" VIII	= " 112	" XXV	= " 137
" IX	= " 113	" XXVI	= " 138
" X	= " 251	" XXVII	= " 136
" XI	= " 116	" XXVIII	= " 139
" XII	= " 114	" XXIX	= " 140
" XIII	= " 115	" XXX	= " 255
" XIV	= " 252	" XXXI	= " 141
" XV	= " 253	" XXXII	= " 142
" XVI	= " 92	" XXXIII	= " 143
" XVII	= " 93	" XXXIV	= " 256

3° Echellensis Collection.

ECH. I	= VAt. 8	ECH. XVII	= VAt. 176
" II	= " 47	" XVIII	= " 249
" III	= " 48	" XIX	= " 231
" IV	= " 51	" XX	= " 210
" V	= " 29	" XXI	= " 250
" VI	= " 70	" XXVII	= " 194
" XI	= " 169	" XXXVI	= " 102
" XII	= " 172	" LIX	= " 209
" XIV	= " 146	" LX	= " 232
" XVI	= " 100	" LXIV	= " 101

4° *Amida Collection.*


AMID. I	= V ^{AT} . 83	AMID. X	= V ^{AT} . 42
" II	= " 84	" XI	= " 43
" III	= " 61	" XII	= " 44
" IV	= " 224	" XIII	= "
" V	= " 24	" XIV	= "
" VI	= " 23	" XV	= " 223
" VII	= " 184	" XVII	= " 206
" VIII	= " 90	" XVIII	= " 221
" IX	= " 63	" XIX	= " 201

5° *Beroe Collection.*

BERGEEENS. I	= V ^{AT} . 159	BERGEEENS. VIII	= V ^{AT} . 121
" III	= " 243	" IX	= " 170
" IV	= " 130	" XII	= "
" V	= " 131	" XIII	= " 220
" VI	= " 202		

6° *Assemani Collection.*

ASS. I	= V ^{AT} . 160	ASS. XXIV	= V ^{AT} . 242
" II	= " 161	" XXV	= " 233
" III	= " 103	" XXVI	= " 234
" IV	= " 119	" XXVII	= " 235
" V	= " 120	" XXVIII	= " 236
" VI	= " 126	" XXIX	= " 237
" VII	= " 118	" XXX	= " 238
" VIII	= " 104	" XXXI	= " 239
" IX	= " 105	" XXXII	= " 240
" X	= " 109	" XXXIII	= " 241
" XI	= " 135	" XXXIV	= " 59
" XII	= " 163	" XXXV	= " 74
" XIII	= " 162	" XXXVI	= " 77
" XIV	= " 144	" XXXVII	= " 40
" XV	= " 94	" XXXVIII	= " 76
" XVI	= " 155	" XXXIX	= " 53
" XVII	= " 1	" XL	= " 41
" XVIII	= " 14	" XLI	= " 21
" XIX	= " 31	" XLII	= " 80
" XX	= " 30	" XLIII	= " 81
" XXI	= " 39	" XLIV	= " 82
" XXII	= " 52	" XLV	= " 174
" XXIII	= " 50	" XLVI	= " 156



Supplement.

Ass. LXXV (A)	= VAt. 216	Ass. LXXXI (A)	= VAt. 217
" LXXVI (A)	= " 133	" LXXXII (A)	= " 215
" LXXVII (A)	= " 196	" LXXXIII (A)	= " 218
" LXXVIII (A)	= " 134	" LXXXIV (A)	= " 219
" LXXIX (A)	= " 200	" XCVI (A)	= " 245
" LXXX (A)	= " 207		

7° Scandar Collection.

Scand. I	= VAt. 91	Scand. XIX	= VAt. 244
" II	= " 64	" XX	= " 183
" III	= " 150	" XXI	= " 182
" IV	= " 187	" XXII	= " 152
" V	= " 204	" XXIII	= " 132
" VI	= " 175	" XXIV	= " 166
" VII	= " 180	" XXV	= " 171
" VIII	= " 222	" XXVI	= " 168
" IX	= " 177	" XXVII	= " 173
" X	= " 178	" XXVIII	= " 96
" XI	= " 149	" XXIX	= " 58
" XII	= " 185	" XXX	= " 97
" XIII	= " 165	" XXXI	= " 147
" XIV	= " 129	" XXXII	= " 37
" XV	= " 179	" XXXIII	= " 78
" XVI	= " 157	" XXXIV	= " 11
" XVII	= " 164	" XXXV	= " 192
" XVIII	= " 127		

8° Carafa Collection.

Car. LXII	= VAt. 49	Car. LXV	= VAt. 75
" LXIII	= " 54	" LXVI	= " 79
" LXIV	= " 20		

9° Propaganda Collection.

Prop. I	= VAt. 247	Prop. X	= VAt. 55 t.2
" II	= " 56	" XI	= " 55 t.3
" III	= " 71	" XII	= " 38
" IV	= " 60	" XII ^{bis}	= " 73
" V	= " 248	" XIII	= " 246
" VI	= " 32	" XIV	= " 167
" VII	= " 33	" XV	= " 153
" VIII	= " 34	" XVI	= " 151
" IX	= " 55 t.1		

II.

CONCORDANCE OF THE NEW NUMBERS WITH THE OLD.

VAT. 1 = ASS. XVII.	VAT. 42 = AMID. X.
" 2 = VAT. II.	" 43 = AMID. XI.
" 3 = VAT. III.	" 44 = AMID. XII.
" 4 = VAT. V.	" 45 = VAT. XVIII.
" 5 = VAT. IV.	" 46 = VAT. XIX.
" 6 = VAT. XXXVIII.	" 47 = ECHELL. II.
" 7 = VAT. I.	" 48 = ECHELL. III.
" 8 = ECHELL. I.	" 49 = CAR. LXII.
" 9 = VAT. VII.	" 50 = ASSEM. XXIII.
" 10 = VAT. VI.	" 51 = ECHELL. IV.
" 11 = SCAND. XXXIV.	" 52 = ASSEM. XXII.
" 12 = NITR. I.	" 53 = ASSEM. XXXIX.
" 13 = NITR. II.	" 54 = CAR. LXIII.
" 14 = ASS. XVIII.	" 55 = PROP. IX-XI.
" 15 = VAT. VIII.	" 56 = PROP. II.
" 16 = VAT. X.	" 57 = VAT. XLVI.
" 17 = VAT. IX.	" 58 = SCAND. XXIX.
" 18 = VAT. XXXIV.	" 59 = ASSEM. XXXIV.
" 19 = VAT. XI.	" 60 = PROP. IV.
" 20 = CAR. LXIV.	" 61 = AMID. III.
" 21 = ASSEM. XLI.	" 62 = VAT. XXV.
" 22 = VAT. XII.	" 63 = AMID. IX.
" 23 = AMID. VI.	" 64 = SCAND. II.
" 24 = AMID. V.	" 65 = VAT. XVI.
" 25 = NITR. III.	" 66 = VAT. XVII.
" 26 = NITR. IV.	" 67 = VAT. XXIII.
" 27 = VAT. XV.	" 68 = VAT. XXI.
" 28 = VAT. XXIX.	" 69 = VAT. XXII.
" 29 = ECHELL. V.	" 70 = ECHELL. VI.
" 30 = ASSEM. XX.	" 71 = PROP. III.
" 31 = ASSEM. XIX.	" 72 = VAT. LIX (A).
" 32 = PROP. VI.	" 73 = PROP. XII <i>bis</i> .
" 33 = PROP. VII.	" 74 = ASSEM. XXXV.
" 34 = PROP. VIII.	" 75 = CAR. LXV.
" 35 = VAT. XXXVI.	" 76 = ASSEM. XXXVIII.
" 36 = VAT. XXX.	" 77 = ASSEM. XXXVI.
" 37 = SCAND. XXXII.	" 78 = SCAND. XXXIII.
" 38 = PROP. XII.	" 79 = CAR. LXVI.
" 39 = ASSEM. XXI.	" 80 = ASSEM. XLII.
" 40 = ASSEM. XXXVII.	" 81 = ASSEM. XLIII.
" 41 = ASSEM. XL.	" 82 = ASSEM. XLIV.

VAT. 83 = AMID. I.
 " 84 = AMID. II.
 " 85 = VAT. XLVIII.
 " 86 = VAT. XX.
 " 87 = VAT. XXIV.
 " 88 = VAT. XXVI.
 " 89 = VAT. XXVII.
 " 90 = AMID. VIII.
 " 91 = SCAND. I.
 " 92 = NITR. XVI.
 " 93 = NITR. XVII.
 " 94 = ASSEM. XV.
 " 95 = VAT. XXXV.
 " 96 = SCAND. XXVIII.
 " 97 = SCAND. XXX.
 " 98 = VAT. III (A).
 " 99 = VAT. CL (A).
 " 100 = ECHELL. XVI.
 " 101 = ECHELL. LXIV.
 " 102 = ECHELL. XXXVI.
 " 103 = ASSEM. III.
 " 104 = ASSEM. VIII.
 " 105 = ASSEM. IX.
 " 106 = NITR. XXIV.
 " 107 = VAT. XXXIX.
 " 108 = VAT. XLVII.
 " 109 = ASSEM. X.
 " 110 = NITR. VI.
 " 111 = NITR. VII.
 " 112 = NITR. VIII.
 " 113 = NITR. IX.
 " 114 = NITR. XII.
 " 115 = NITR. XIII.
 " 116 = NITR. XI.
 " 117 = NITR. V.
 " 118 = ASSEM. VII.
 " 119 = ASSEM. IV.
 " 120 = ASSEM. V.
 " 121 = BERCEENS. VIII.
 " 122 = NITR. XVIII.
 " 123 = NITR. XIX.
 " 124 = NITR. XXI.
 " 125 = NITR. XXII.

VAT. 126 = ASSEM. VI.
 " 127 = SCAND. XVIII.
 " 128 = VAT. XIV.
 " 129 = SCAND. XIV.
 " 130 = BERCEENS. IV.
 " 131 = BERCEENS. V.
 " 132 = SCAND. XXIII.
 " 133 = ASS. LXXVI (A).
 " 134 = ASS. LXXVIII (A).
 " 135 = ASSEM. XI.
 " 136 = NITR. XXVII.
 " 137 = NITR. XXV.
 " 138 = NITR. XXVI.
 " 139 = NITR. XXVIII.
 " 140 = NITR. XXIX.
 " 141 = NITR. XXXI.
 " 142 = NITR. XXXII.
 " 143 = NITR. XXXIII.
 " 144 = ASSEM. XIV.
 " 145 = VAT. XL.
 " 146 = ECHELL. XIV.
 " 147 = SCAND. XXXI.
 " 148 = VAT. XXXI.
 " 149 = SCAND. XI.
 " 150 = SCAND. III.
 " 151 = PROP. XVI.
 " 152 = SCAND. XXII.
 " 153 = PROP. XV.
 " 154 = VAT. XIII.
 " 155 = ASSEM. XVI.
 " 156 = ASSEM. XLVI.
 " 157 = SCAND. XVI.
 " 158 = VAT. XXXVII.
 " 159 = BERCEENS. I.
 " 160 = ASSEM. I.
 " 161 = ASSEM. II.
 " 162 = ASSEM. XIII.
 " 163 = ASSEM. XII.
 " 164 = SCAND. XVII.
 " 165 = SCAND. XIII.
 " 166 = SCAND. XXIV.
 " 167 = PROP. XIV.
 " 168 = SCAND. XXVI.

VAT. 169 = ECHELL. XI.
 " 170 = BERGEEN. IX.
 " 171 = SCAND. XXV.
 " 172 = ECHELL. XII.
 " 173 = SCAND. XXVII.
 " 174 = ASSEM. XLV.
 " 175 = SCAND. VI.
 " 176 = ECHELL. XVII.
 " 177 = SCAND. IX.
 " 178 = SCAND. X.
 " 179 = SCAND. XV.
 " 180 = SCAND. VII.
 " 181 = ADD. I.
 " 182 = SCAND. XXI.
 " 183 = SCAND. XX.
 " 184 = AMID. VII.
 " 185 = SCAND. XII.
 " 186 = VAT. XXXII.
 " 187 = SCAND. IV.
 " 188 = VAT. XXVIII.
 " 189 = ADD. II.
 " 190 = VAT. XLIV.
 " 191 = ADD. III.
 " 192 = SCAND. XXXV.
 " 193 = VAT. XXXIII.
 " 194 = ECHELL. XXVII.
 " 195 = ADD. IV.
 " 196 = ASSEM. LXXVII(A).
 " 197 = VAT. X (A).
 " 198 = NITR. XX.
 " 199 = VAT. LV (A).
 " 200 = ASS. LXXIX (A).
 " 201 = AMID. XIX.
 " 202 = BERGEENS. VI.
 " 203 = VAT. XVII (A).
 " 204 = SCAND. V.
 " 205 = VAT. CXIV (A).
 " 206 = AMID. XVII.
 " 207 = ASS. LXXX (A).
 " 208 = VAT. CLXVIII (A).
 " 209 = ECHELL. LIX.
 " 210 = ECHELL. XX.
 " 211 = VAT. XLI (A).
 " 212 = VAT. CXXIII (A).

VAT. 213 = VAT. CXLI (A).
 " 214 = VAT. CLI (A).
 " 215 = ASS. LXXXII (A).
 " 216 = ASS. LXXXV (A).
 " 217 = ASS. LXXXI (A).
 " 218 = ASS. LXXXIII (A).
 " 219 = ASS. LXXXIV (A).
 " 220 = BERGEENS. XIII.
 " 221 = AMID. XVIII.
 " 222 = SCAND. VIII.
 " 223 = AMID. XV.
 " 224 = AMID. IV.
 " 225 = VAT. LII (A).
 " 226 = VAT. XLII.
 " 227 = VAT. CLXXXIII(A).
 " 228 = VAT. XLIX.
 " 229 = VAT. XLIX (A).
 " 230 = ADD. V.
 " 231 = ECHELL. XIX.
 " 232 = ECHELL. LX.
 " 233 = ASSEM. XXV.
 " 234 = ASSEM. XXVI.
 " 235 = ASSEM. XXVII.
 " 236 = ASSEM. XXVIII.
 " 237 = ASSEM. XXIX.
 " 238 = ASSEM. XXX.
 " 239 = ASSEM. XXXI.
 " 240 = ASSEM. XXXII.
 " 241 = ASSEM. XXXIII.
 " 242 = ASSEM. XXIV.
 " 243 = BERGEENS. III.
 " 244 = SCAND. XIX.
 " 245 = ASSEM. XCVI (A).
 " 246 = PROP. XIII.
 " 247 = PROP. I.
 " 248 = PROP. V.
 " 249 = ECHELL. XVIII.
 " 250 = ECHELL. XXI.
 " 251 = NITR. X.
 " 252 = NITR. XIV.
 " 253 = NITR. XV.
 " 254 = NITR. XXIII.
 " 255 = NITR. XXX.
 " 256 = NITR. XXXIV.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Petite Introduction aux Inventaires des Archives du Vatican.

Par le R. P. Louis Guérard, prêtre de l'Oratoire, Paris: Picard, 1901. 8°, pp. 39.

The opening of the Vatican Archives by Leo XIII to the general public of scholars has naturally brought to Rome not a few persons anxious to profit by this vast repertorium of historical documents. It is not every one who is properly equipped for the use of the written authorities; as a preliminary, both a general and a special palæographical training is necessary. This may be now acquired, either in one of the university schools of history that have grown up in Europe, or at Rome within the limits of the Vatican, where a two years' course of three lessons a week is now in working order. A good French manual, that of M. Giry, contains excellent doctrine, and the classic German "Handbuch der Diplomatik" (Leipzig, 1889) of H. Bresslau is simply indispensable for any complete training.

But how shall the would-be editor of original materials out of the Vatican Archives go to work in order to know where they actually are? If he knows precisely what document he wants, it may not be very difficult to lay his hand upon it—the obliging officials will probably find it for him through means of certain ancient inventories of the Archives, or through their own trained instinct. But the special student of some line or problem of history knows, only too often, no more than the general nature of his subject, and its limits in time and place.

If the Vatican Archives had ever been fully inventoried, individual research would still be toilsome, by reason of their vastness. But no such work has yet been done, perhaps ever can be done for this *mare magnum* of mediæval and later history. With the exception of the workers on the "Repertorium Germanicum" (Berlin, 1897) no systematic dépouillement of the several depositories of the Archives has been attempted for the centuries this side of the thirteenth, and that valuable work only reaches the pontificate of Eugene IV; nor does it pretend to be exhaustive.¹

¹ For the study of German history the authors of the R. G. have examined thirteen depositories of the Archives: (1) Registra Vaticana, (2) Registra Brevium, (3) Registra Supplicationum, (4) Registra Lateranensia, (5) Libri obligationum prælatorum, (6) Libri annatorum, (7) Libri Solutionum, (8) Libri quitantiarum, (9) Introitus et Exitus, (10) Libri bulletarum et mandatorum, (11) Diversa cameralia, (12) Acta of the Sacred College (of Cardinals), (13) Various other documents scattered in isolated volumes.

The Abbé Guérard, priest of the French Oratory, and one of the national chaplains of St. Louis des Français at Rome, undertook in the *Annales* of that society (January, 1897) to prepare a guide for the use of the existing inventories of the Vatican Archives, with the particular purpose of aiding the students of the mediæval history of provincial France. This study, somewhat enlarged, appeared in the same periodical (July, 1900), and is now presented to the general public. Its few pages are the result of no little toil, and the author acknowledges that without the habitual kindness of the sub-archivist of the Vatican even these notes could not have been put together.

The nearest approach to a general inventory is owing to Petrus Doninus de Pretis, prefect of the Archives in 1727.² It is a very summary enumeration of the contents of the greater part of the volumes that contain the official acts of the Cancellaria Apostolica. It represents, therefore, the most important part of the Vatican Archives. For the thirteenth century there exists an inventory of the names of persons and places mentioned in the subscriptions of the bulls. From John XXII to the end of the Great Schism there is a double series of "Registers" of bulls—the "*Regesta Avenionensia*," and the "*Regesta Vaticana*." The former were removed to the Vatican towards the end of the eighteenth century. Two inventories of them exist, made at Avignon in the eighteenth century—one of them is in 85 folio volumes. The "*Regesta Vaticana*" for the fourteenth century are an official transcription of the preceding. The division of "*Epistolæ Secretæ*" that contains the political correspondence of the popes in that period, gave way in the fifteenth century to the series of briefs (*Epistolæ Breves*) that have been indexed from Clement VII to Leo XI (1523–1605). A very important series in several thousand volumes is that of the "*Regesta Lateranensia*" (*Dataria*) that reaches from Boniface IX to Leo XIII. It does not seem to have been the object of any known inventory, though those who know it best say that its volumes present for the end of the fourteenth century a more complete portrait of papal administration than the "*Regesta Vaticana*" themselves. In addition, there are the 7,011 volumes of "*Supplicationes*" or requests and petitions, lately transferred to the Vatican, likewise insufficiently inventoried, though a fair idea of their contents for the

² Cf. Baumgarten, "*Untersuchungen und Urkunden ueber die Camera Collegii Cardinalium fuer die Zeit von 1295–1437*," Leipzig, 1898, also A. Cauchie, "*De la création d'une Ecole Belge à Rome*," Tournai, 1896. In this latter brochure, Dr. Cauchie has collected all the earlier literature relative to the great divisions of the Archives. M. Guérard declares this study "*un aperçu d'ensemble fort utile*" for the use of the Archives.

fourteenth and fifteenth centuries may be gained from the epoch-making work of Denifle.¹

For these huge collections of original materials, M. Guérard indicates with all possible precision, and after such personal examination as the circumstances permit, the actual state of the inventories, indexes, summaries of contents, etc., as they are kept in the "cabinet de travail" of Mgr. Wenzel present sub-archivist.²

The records of the financial administration of the papacy are very abundant since the fourteenth century, inclusive. Several valuable studies, like those of Gottlob, Kirsch and others, have lately appeared, based on these materials. These financial records form part of the documents of the Camera Apostolica (Treasury Department of the Holy See), all whose existing records have been inventoried up to the fifteenth century by M. de Loye.³ For the last four centuries no detailed inventory is at hand, as far as is known, although the volumes of each pontificate are recorded in De Pretis. Mgr. Baumgarten has published a conspectus of the "Obligationes" as far as Julius II.⁴

A large portion of the records of the Camera Apostolica, particularly for modern times, is now incorporated with the Italian governmental archives; two manuscript inventories enable the student to work with some satisfaction. The earliest of these documents go back to the end of the fourteenth century, and the latest come down to 1860. Before 1870 this collection was preserved in the Palazzo Ugolini, near the Sapienza. In it, among other valuable deposits, are records of six provincial sub-treasuries of the Holy See—Avignon, Bologna, Campagna, Marittima, Fermo, Marca, the Patrimonio. It is said that in all there are some five hundred volumes of the financial records of the Holy See in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries.

Another extensive collection of the documents of the Holy See is that once kept in the old papal citadel of Castel Sant-Angelo, now part of the Vatican Archives. It is provided with a chronological

¹ "La Désolation des Eglises de France pendant la Guerre de Cent Ans." Paris, Picard, 1899, 3 vols.

² Sans la complaisance et la patience de Mgr. Wenzel et de son neveu, M. Ranuzzi, il serait à peu près impossible à un débutant d'utiliser les répertoires, Guérard, op. cit., p. 32.

³ "Archives de la Chambre apostolique," Paris. Fontemoing, 1899. Cf. *Moyen Age*, 1899, pp. 414 sqq.

⁴ Cf. introd. to *Rep. Germ.* The records of the Camera Apostolica are divided into three classes: Introitus et Exitus; Servitia (Obligationes); Collectariæ, Inventaria et Processus. The vicissitudes of these records, related in the work just cited, have somewhat enhanced the difficulties of research-work among them.

index, more or less complete, and now more or less corresponding to the actual state and disposition of the records.¹

Finally, there are in the Vatican Archives what is known as the "Miscellanea," documents collected in boxes or bound in volumes, varying greatly in date and character. One class of them, the *Miscellanea Instrumentorum*, is kept in *cassette* or small receptacles, classed chronologically. Three of these *cassette* contain documents previous to the year 1300.² The latest of them contain materials of quite modern history. They may be consulted by indicating the year or decade in question. Another class of these documents is called simply "Miscellanea"; according to M. Cauchie (*op. cit.*, p. 289) there are more than two thousand volumes of them, mostly acquisitions made by the popes in modern times.³

The Archives of the papal Secretariate of State and the Borghese Archives have each an inventory. Though the former is a summary one, it acts as a guide to the enormous collection of nunciature reports since the Reformation. For France alone, it is rumored that more than 600 volumes of such documents are preserved, containing material of very miscellaneous character.⁴

The inventory of the State Department of the Holy See mentions also: "Lettere di Cardinali, vescovi, principi, particolari e soldati." There ought to be here a very rich harvest for the historian of man-

¹ Cf. Paul Fabre, "Note sur les archives du Château St. Ange, *Mélanges de l'Ecole de Rome*," Avril, 1893. "Ce fonds contenait jadis les actes d'un procès de l'archevêque de Tolède au seizième siècle, Barthélémy Carranza, poursuivi par l'Inquisition d'Espagne," Guérard, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

² For the history of the Vatican Archives and Library previous to that period see the researches of De Rossi and P. Ehrle.

³ That our readers may see what "curiosa" are to be met with, even in these dustheaps of the Archives, I reprint the description given by Dr. Cauchie (after Dr. Schlecht) of the contents of one of the large cabinets (*armoires*) containing what is known as "*Varia Politicorum*." "En 1890, dit encore M. Cauchie, M. le docteur Schlecht a fait un dépouillement complet des 176 volumes qui portent ce nom. Il y a vu des paperasses de toutes espèces: des statistiques de l'administration des Etats pontificaux et parfois des autres gouvernements, des instructions aux envoyés du Saint Siège, des relations de nonces, des bulles et des brefs, des traités d'alliance, de guerre et de paix, les rapports des ambassadeurs vénitiens, des lettres envoyées ou reçues par des princes, des actes des Diètes et des Parlements, des décrets de souverains; des opuscules historiques, des catalogues des archives pontificales, des prières, des poèmes, des comédies, des énigmes, etc. . . ; toutefois la politique fait l'objet principal de ces documents. Ils concernent surtout le XVIIe et le XVIIIe siècles, mais il y a aussi quelques pièces relatives aux âges antérieurs. En général, ce ne sont que des copies. Les autres mélanges ne sont pas moins bigarres: des papiers de nonciatures, des bulles, des édits, des ordonnances (Bandi), des actes de l'Inquisition, des ouvrages de théologie, des visitations, des actes relatifs aux ordres religieux, des diarii, des vies de papes, etc."

⁴ These reports are now being (partially) published, especially those concerning Germany. A society has been established in France—the Archives de l'histoire religieuse de la France—with the avowed purpose of publishing these records, at least in analysis.

ners and institutions, as well as for the editors of "mémoires" and the writers of biographies from the sixteenth to the nineteenth century.¹

Cardinal Garampi (1725-1792), prefect of the Vatican Archives from 1751 to 1772, is responsible for a certain amount of classification of the materials of the Vatican Archives. It was his intention to compile an "Orbis Christianus" which would be for all Christendom what the "Gallia Christiana" was for France. For that purpose he compiled, or caused to be compiled' out of the various depositories of the Vatican Archives a certain number of general repertories of "notitiæ"—they were particularly drawn from the "Regesta" of papal bulls, and from the records of the "Camera Apostolica," although printed indications were not neglected. The paper notes or "fiches" on which were made the annotations that he sought are still preserved in the rooms of the sub-archivist, and are particularly useful for those seeking clearly defined materials. They are not inventories, strictly speaking, and in no wise represent a methodical and systematic *dépouillement* of the archives. The inventory of De Pretis was utilized in the collection of these raw materials for a general documentary church history. Under the headings—bishops, abbots, benefices, miscellanea, popes, cardinals, Roman churches, pontifical offices, Garampi put together fifty-three volumes which, with the twelve volumes of a chronological and the ten of an alphabetical index, form an important "first help" of some seventy-five volumes. If Garampi had examined completely some one of the several deposits of the Archives, and made an alphabetical index of his notes, his work would have been even yet indispensable. As it was, he only thought of the documents that were to appear in his projected "Orbis Christianus," and Fr. Conrad Eubel, the learned editor of the episcopal lists of Christendom since Innocent III., would have found his task considerably lightened. There was already an example in the labors of the contemporary Avignon archivists (Guérard, pp. 14-15) whose materials, however, were not then at the immediate disposal of Garampi. Such as they are, the "fiches" of Garampi no longer correspond with accuracy to the actual state of the Archives, or are in need of interpretation. M. Guérard furnishes useful directions to the research-student whose duty compels him to utilize these folios. It must be remembered that they were put together for the personal use of

¹ Cf. "Ricardo de Hinojosa, Los despachos della diplomacia pontificia en España," Madrid.

² Cf. D. Gregorio Palmieri, "Ad Vaticani archivii regesta RR. PP. manu-ductio," Roma, 1885, pp. xiv-xv.

Garampi, or at most, of his secretaries and the employés of the Archives. M. Guérard at the end of his instructive brochure, urges all research-students engaged at the Vatican in the editing of materials for local European history, to not wander from those that are indicated in the "fiches" of Garampi, the Avignon inventories and M. de Loye's inventory of the Camera Apostolica to the end of the fourteenth century. The personal examination of the entire huge mass of manuscript records could only be fruitful in case it covered a very large geographical field. In the future it will be easier, to study at first hand Vatican materials for the fourteenth century, since the French School of History and Archæology at Rome has undertaken a complete assorting of all the "Regesta" for that period. In the meantime the historical student will profit greatly by the works of MM. Teige,¹ Tomaseth² and Tangl.³

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Origines du Culte Chrétien. Etude sur la liturgie latine avant Charlemagne. Par Mgr. L. Duchesne, Membre de l'Institut. 3d edition. Paris: Fontemoing, 1902. 8°, pp. 556.

As compared with the first edition of this admirable manual the third shows an increase of some fifty odd pages, distributed through the sixteen chapters of the work, and the hundred pages of appendixes. To the latter have been added the "Ordo Romanus" for the three days before Easter, and the Latin translation of the Canons of Hippolytus, the latter a welcome help to such as have not the work of Haneberg. For those who do not know this indispensable liturgical work we may say that it is divided into the following chapters: The Early Christian World (Christian communities; local churches; episcopal dioceses; ecclesiastical provinces, patriarchates, national churches), The Mass in the Orient, the Roman and the Gallican Liturgies, Liturgical books and formulæ, The Oldest Books of the Latin Liturgy, The Mass at Rome, The Gallican Mass, The Christian Feasts, Baptism, Ordination, Liturgical Dress, Dedication of Churches, Consecration of Virgins, Nuptial Blessing, Reconciliation of Penitents, The Divine Office.

¹ "Beitraege zum paepstlichen Kanzleiwesen des XIII und XIV Jahrhunderts" (Mittheilungen des Instituts fuer österreichische Geschichtsforschung), Wien, 1896.

² "Die Register und Sekretaere Urbans V und Gregors XI" (ibid.), 1898.

³ "Die paepstliche Register von Benedict XII bis Gregor XI" (Innsbruck), 1898. Cf. also the introduction and notes of Denifle, "Specimina palæografica Regestorum RR. PP., Roma, 1888. The last two works, says M. Guerard (p. 13), give "le meilleur aperçu d'ensemble qui ait été donné jusqu'ici sur les registres du XIV siècle."

Mgr. Duchesne does not propose to exhibit in this work a portrait of ecclesiastical antiquities in general, but only of those which may be classed under the rubric of collective acts, acts of public interest to each local church, which are usually performed before its authorities and within its walls. Moreover, the work is strictly historical, dealing as a rule with the known attainable facts for each paragraph, and in the language of the original witnesses or what must pass for their evidence. Theological discussions and solutions would swell the book to an unwieldy volume—for such the reader is referred to the numerous learned books that deal with the same. Our author is concerned only with the general outlines of the public services of the Church as they appeared to the Christian eye from the fourth to the eighth century. Though Mgr. Duchesne disclaims any direct attempt at edification, let it be said that every priest will rise from the perusal of his learned book filled with a joyous faith, gifted with a satisfactory historic insight into the origins of the holy functions that he daily discharges.

"These ancient rites," he says (p. viii), "are doubly sacred; they come to us from God through Christ and the Church; even if they did not wear that halo, they would still be holy from their contact with the piety of a hundred generations. For so many centuries mankind has thus prayed to God! How many emotions, how many joys, how much affection, how many tears have these sacred books beheld, these rites and formulas made holy!"

Certainly no living historian is more capable than the Director of the French School of History and Archæology at Rome of throwing abundant light on the public services of Western Christianity in those four fateful centuries. The City of Rome is the living center of that worship from the days of Constantine, and this early mediæval Rome is almost the apanage of Mgr. Duchesne. Its bishops, its churches, its monuments and inscriptions, its institutions, customs and traditions, its hopes and fears, ideals and conflicts, its splendor and power, as well as its seamy and human side, are all an open book to the editor of the *Liber Pontificalis*. With him as guide we may learn to know and esteem all these liturgical "*Mirabilia Urbis Romæ*" that Charlemagne witnessed and Anglo-Saxon kings came from their island home to revere and imitate. It is the Rome of the "*Ordines Romani*," with its multitude of rare and curious survivals out of the earliest ages of the Christian religion, its inborn racial "*pietas*" toward the past, its sure sense of what was sober and decent in ritual, its inherited gravity and majesty that shine in all those holy rites which the ends of the earth still continue to borrow from her.

Teachers and students of mediæval history will profit much by mastery of this volume. Professors of theology, particularly of sacramental theology, will read it with equal profit, and all interested in the charming story of the Christian liturgy will draw from it both rare information and genuine edification. It deserves the compliment of translation into all the great vernaculars and particularly into English.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Ames Religieuses. Par Henri Bremond. Paris: Perrin, 1902. 8°, pp. 284.

L'Enfant et le Vie. Par Henri Bremond. Paris: Retaux, 1902. 8°, pp. 278.

There is firmness at once and delicacy of touch in the literary manner of Fr. Bremond. Every new work from his pen reveals genuine merits of feeling, discernment, style, and a certain kindly intimate sympathy with the temper and the thought of the modern world. He has a definite message for his fellow-men, but he blends it with well-bred and shrewd conversation on the things they love and admire—literature, education, spiritual experience, the strong vivid play of personality. He finds no little that is good and admirable in the highly individualized religion of certain noble minds without the pale of the Church. One is moved to see the skill and sureness with which he extracts from the lives of John Keble, Edward Thring, Arnold of Rugby, and others, the lessons they offer to the men of his own France. After all, there is something un-Catholic and illiberal in excessive nationalism, something narrow and withering, a thinning down of the larger stream of general human interest and experience. In the writings of Fr. Bremond there is a marked reaction against such exclusivism and arrogance—*Je prends mon bien où il se trouve*—seems to be his motto. The volume on “L'Enfant et la Vie” contains so many tender and exquisite pages that, in spite of its miscellaneous character, every one interested in the Christian education of little children can read it with equal pleasure and profit.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Geschichte der Universitaet Dillingen (1549–1804) und der mit ihr verbundenen Lehr und Erziehungsanstalten. Von Dr. Thomas Specht. Freiburg: Herder, 1902. 8°, pp. xv + 706.

This is a very conscientious, painstaking, instructive work—few of the modern special histories of universities surpass it for manifold suggestiveness. Dillingen was founded in 1549 by Cardinal Otto Truchsess, Bishop of Augsburg (1543–1573), one of the most

vigorous men of the Counter-Reformation. Not satisfied with suggesting and urging the Collegium Germanicum at Rome, he brought about (1549) the establishment in the town of Dillingen of an ecclesiastical academy or college under the patronage of St. Jerome, that was shortly (1551) raised to the dignity of a university by Julius III. Like several other German Catholic university schools, it soon passed (1563) into the hands of the Jesuits, who administered it until their suppression in 1773—two hundred and ten years. Dr. Specht follows out in close detail the general history of the school for this period, the organization of its faculties, its privileges, curricula of studies, administration, literary and scientific labors, student-life. We have in these pages the entire inner life of a Jesuit university of the eighteenth century. In the two centuries of its existence the theological faculty alone had over two hundred professors. Short terms and frequent changes were the order, as can be seen at once from the list of teachers. Among the theologians of repute were Hieronymus Torres, Gregory of Valentia, Christopher Rassler, Paul Laymann, Tobias Lohner, Alphonsus Pisanus. Dillingen enjoyed an excellent reputation for the study of canon law. Schmalzgrueber, Laymann, Pirhing, Pichler, taught here. Among the professors was the famous Irish Jesuit, Stephan White, author of an "Apologia pro Hibernia" (Dublin, 1849) against the calumnies of Gerald Barry.

From 1773 to 1804 Dillingen went through many vicissitudes. In the latter years it ceased to exist as a university, after more than two and a half centuries of activity. The Bavarian government, successor to the civil jurisdiction of the Bishops of Augsburg, carrying out the principles of the Napoleonic secularisation of the ecclesiastical properties, completed the ruin that had really begun with the financial crippling that followed the Thirty Years War. Dr. Specht gives a long list of valuable academic documents—papal and episcopal constitutions, instructions, bye-laws, programs. A list of the manuscript authorities (university records, faculty minutes, etc.) and a bibliography of printed works used in the compilation of the book, make it very serviceable for the intelligence of a small, but meritorious university.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Unpublished Letters of Charles Carroll of Carrollton, and of His Father, Charles Carroll of Doughoregan. Compiled and edited with a memoir by Thomas Meagher Field. New York: The United States Catholic Historical Society, 1902. Pp. 250. There are revealed in this volume of interesting letters phases of colonial life that have not come down to us in the pages of even

the most faithful and painstaking of historians; the appearance of this monograph is only another proof that if we wish to obtain an accurate notion of the past it is necessary to explore the sources of history. The more ample narratives of the era of the Revolution aim to sketch the principal characters and scenes of that eventful period, and while it is doubtless true that the philosophical student may perceive in their outlines men and things very much as they actually existed, the general reader will derive a more just conception by examining the original documents for himself.

Of all the memorials of those stirring times which have been discovered by either scholarship or patriotism the unpublished letters of Charles Carroll and those of his father form one of the most instructive and entertaining that have recently been offered to the public. From an examination of them we see clearly the mental equipment of one of the most amiable as well as one of the ablest of the Revolutionary leaders.

In his own generation, as in ours, Charles Carroll was known as a cultured and uncompromising patriot. He was likewise known to have had a firm grasp of the great constitutional questions which presented themselves to the consideration of his contemporaries. In what manner "The First Citizen" acquired this mastery of public affairs, however, is not so generally known. The letters included in the monograph before us show the successive stages in his development. Interesting as may be the contemplation of this and other questions, the impression which a reader of the letters will be likely to receive is that the younger Carroll was the product not so much of either French or English schools, for he enjoyed the benefits of both, as of a healthy American ancestry. His chief obligation was to the solicitude of an intelligent and Christian father, who carefully pointed out the value of sound religious principles. Not, indeed, in a didactic manner, like one who had only recently acquired them himself, but with the artlessness of one who held them in solution and who could not have written otherwise without doing violence to cherished convictions.

Even to those most familiar with our history the present volume introduces a character hitherto regarded as somewhat shadowy. Yet the correspondence of the elder Carroll shows him to have been anything but an insubstantial personage. He comes before us as a shrewd, generous and enlightened patriot profoundly interested in and fully comprehending all the public questions of his day. These qualities alone, however, would not have distinguished him from many of his contemporaries. It is his affectionate interest in everything designed to fit his son to adorn the station to which wealth and

talents invited him that gives Charles Carroll of Doughoregan a claim to our esteem.

Though the elder Carroll was not indifferent to worldly considerations, no sordid sentiment can be found in any of his numerous and unreserved communications to his son. If he manifested a strong desire that the future statesman should apply himself to the study of the law, it was not only that he might thereby the better protect his property interests but that he might be able also to give to his neighbors the benefit of sound legal advice. The thought of serving his fellowman appears never to have been absent from his mind.

Between two such men there was to be expected the most perfect harmony, and in the letters from the owner of Doughoregan Manor we catch no glimpse of even a momentary misunderstanding. Indeed it would be difficult to find elsewhere in colonial records so charming a picture of domestic life as that suggested by this interesting correspondence. While there were no elements of discord within, clouds were beginning to arise from without. British oppression had long before destroyed the rank and fortune of the O'Carrolls in Ireland. British intolerance, by imposing a double portion of taxes on Catholics, threatened once more to reduce them to a condition of poverty; but, fortunately for the people of every class, the illiberal policy which could discriminate against Catholics with impunity was soon applied to the entire population, and in the spirit of freedom aroused by the attempt the shadow of intolerance passed forever away.

It is not the purpose of this notice to describe either the contents or the character of this entertaining monograph. It would be spoiled by even a good paraphrase. We desire merely to interest the reader in the environment of one of the makers of this nation as well as in the home of a fine old Catholic gentleman of colonial times.

The volume forms a fitting supplement to Miss Rowland's biography of The Signer, and the United States Catholic Historical Society is to be congratulated as well upon its choice of an editor as upon the attractive appearance of this useful contribution to American history.

CHARLES P. MCCARTHY.

CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

Essentials of American History. By Thomas Bonaventure Lawler. Boston: Ginn & Co., 1902. Pp. 420, with index.

The competition among publishers and authors has produced many of the excellent text-books now in use in our schools, and,

perhaps, it is chiefly in respect of simplicity and clearness of arrangement that we are to look for their further improvement. Mr. Lawler makes no apology for offering to the public a new history of the United States. Indeed, to any student who is at the trouble of examining any considerable part of the work no apology is required.

Twenty pages of clear and interesting narrative summarize the achievements of the great navigators who appeared at the end of the fifteenth and the beginning of the succeeding century. Little that is new is seriously to be expected in any work on this era. Nevertheless, Mr. Lawler has imparted to his first chapter a freshness that makes it entertaining reading for even those who are familiar with the period of discovery.

In addition to the maps which usually illustrate this portion of our school histories there is contained in the present volume a chart of the trade routes between the commercial centers of Italy and the markets of India. It is only by some such aid that the young student can be made fully to comprehend the disastrous effect upon Genoese and Venetian trade of the taking of Constantinople. Though it is a commonplace of history to describe the flight of scholars after the fall of the venerable capital of the Eastern Empire, writers have not been accustomed to emphasize the influence of that event in giving character and direction to the nautical activity of the following century.

It is chiefly in the matter of style and arrangement that Mr. Lawler's account of the explorers differs from those given in most of the school histories now in use. It is not by the accumulation of detail but by a striking summary or a happy quotation that he shows himself qualified to prepare a history for the young. For example, the French method of acquiring supremacy in America is thus concisely described by an excerpt from Parkman: "Peaceful, benign, beneficent were the weapons of this conquest. France aimed to subdue not by the sword but by the cross; not to overwhelm and crush the nations. She invaded but to convert, to civilize and embrace them among her children."

Hand in hand with the work of the explorer went the labors of the missionary. A few well-written pages describe the efforts of these spiritual heroes. The roving character of the Indian tribes suggests the magnitude of the task undertaken by the Jesuits, and even if in this instance they failed to attain complete success they established by deeds of heroism unsurpassed in history a standard of character and of devotion to duty that will not soon pass into forgetfulness. The encouraging beginnings, as well as the causes of

the decline of the California missions, receive for the first time in a school history anything like adequate treatment.

Without a tolerably complete account of the events preceding the formation of the Constitution the story of our national development is not easy to write, and, as we may perceive by his distribution of emphasis, this difficulty Mr. Lawler appears fully to recognize. So many able and industrious writers have discussed this portion of American history, however, that it only remains to point out in what respect the present work differs from many of its predecessors.

First, the national period is duly emphasized. The number, excellence and accuracy of the maps is a very important feature of the work, and shows that the author is conscious of the relation which subsists between geography and history. The development of our unequalled system of transportation is well described and, where it is possible to do so, illustrated by interesting cuts. That the importance of our industrial history is not overlooked is apparent from the space devoted to the inventions of Whitney, McCormack, Howe, Morse, Edison and others. Economic and other reforms are given prominence in the narrative. The great financial measures, as well as the movements of population and their causes, receive considerable attention. The author adheres to his purpose to write the essentials of American history, for the summaries following his successive chapters mention only the conspicuous landmarks. In short, the work is admirably planned and ably executed.

CHARLES P. MCCARTHY.

CATHOLIC HIGH SCHOOL, PHILADELPHIA.

Sermons from the Latins. Adapted from Bellarmine, Segneri, and other sources, by Rev. James J. Baxter, D.D. New York: Benziger, 1902. 8°, pp. 618.

It is an almost excessive modesty that leads Dr. Baxter to claim for these sermons that they are only "adaptations." The material of them may, indeed, be taken "from the Latins," but it has been so transformed and so mingled with the author's own thought as to be, to all intents and purposes, his own. Therefore, whatever is said of this volume, in praise or blame, must be for the ears of the reverend preacher himself.

As a matter of fact, the sermons deserve not a little praise, and some blame. Some of the merits we have found in them are these: a decided originality, and sometimes, if not eloquence, at least, beauty and force of expression, a simplicity and vigor of diction, and much that is of doctrinal, ethical and practical value. The defects are

fewer: an occasional ineptitude of word or phrase; here and there a lapse from the specific, and exclusively sacred, character that befits pulpit utterances, some inconclusiveness of proof in certain controversial parts. In spite of these defects, the volume is easily superior to most of the current Catholic sermon books in English. It gives abundant evidence that the author is himself a man of personal original thought and that he has the power of begetting noble and useful thoughts in the mind of his hearers or readers. Not only is the book attractively made and printed, but each of the sixty sermons is provided with a synopsis.

S. Jerome et la Vie du Moine Malchus le Captif. Par Paul van den Ven, docteur en philosophie et lettres. Louvain: J. B. Ista, 1901. 8°, pp. 161.

The *Vita Malchi*, one of the most interesting of the hagiological writings of S. Jerome, is extant in Latin, Greek, and Syriac, each recension being represented by numerous MSS. In 1898, M. J. Kunze, professor of the History of Dogma at Leipzig, put forth the opinion that Jerome can no longer be considered as the original author of the *Vita Malchi*, that he merely translated it from a Greek or a Syriac text, adding to it a prologue of his own. In his learned monograph, Dr. Van den Ven refutes at length the arguments of the Leipzig professor. As Kunze neglected to consult the Greek text of the *Vita Malchi* and based his objections on a Latin translation of it, known as the Sirletto translation, Dr. Van den Ven begins his investigation with a thorough critical study of the Greek original. He edits it for the first time from three of the principal MSS. which contain it, viz.: Cod. Paris. gr. 1605 (XIIth century), Cod. Paris. gr. 1598 (A. D. 993), and Cod. Vat. gr. 1660 (A. D. 916). For the Syriac text he publishes from Add. 12175 (VIIth or VIIIth century) of the British Museum the fragment which is wanting in Sachau's edition of the *Vita Malchi* (*Die Handschriften-Verzeichnisse der königlichen Bibliothek zu Berlin*, XXIII Band, Verzeichniss der syrischen Handschriften, Berlin, 1899, pp. 103-109). The Latin, Greek and Syriac recensions are referred to as H. G. and S, respectively. Dr. Van den Ven takes up in order the objections adduced by Kunze, and shows that they contain no valid reasons for denying to Jerome the original composition of the *Vita Malchi*. Not content with answering Kunze, he establishes his conclusions by arguments of his own and puts in clear light the incontestable literary superiority of H, the substitution in G and S of the direct oration for the indirect oration

of H, the grouping together by G and S of details found scattered in H, the evident tendency in G and S to develop and amplify what strikes their fancy and appeals to their imagination, and finally the manifest allusion which the three recensions make to Vergil's description of the habits of ants (*Aen.*, IV, 402). From all this Dr. Van den Ven concludes that Jerome is really the original author of the *Vita Malchi*, which in turn served as a model to the Greek and Syriac compilers.

He shows, too, that S depends on G, as is clear from the similarity of syntactical construction and the abundance of Greek words in the Syriac text. The author might have dwelt on this at greater length and quoted instances of Greek words perhaps more to the point. In order to ascertain the author of G, Dr. Van den Ven makes a study of the *Vita Pauli Thebensis*, and of the *De viris inlustribus*. He reaches the conclusion that three different redactors translated into Greek the hagiologic writings of Jerome, and that the *Vita Malchi* and the *Vita Hilarionis* had a common translator, probably Sophronius (*De viris inlus.*, ch. CXXXIX). Dr. Van den Ven deserves the thanks of Latin, Greek and Syriac scholars for his learned monograph; it is a valuable contribution at once to philology, historical criticism and patrology.

ARTHUR A. VASCHALDE.

S. Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Tractatus Contra Origenem de Visione Esaiæ quem nunc primum ex Codd. MSS. Casinensibus Ambrosius M. Amelli Monachus Archicoenobii Montis Casini in lucem edidit et illustravit. Tipografia di Monte Cassino, 1901.

The archives of Monte Cassino, it is well known, are one of the richest European depositories of ancient theological manuscripts. Two years ago the learned archivist, Don Ambrogio Amelli, made public a very interesting text, what he holds to be one of the very earliest efforts of Saint Jerome in the field of biblical theology—nothing less than his doctorate thesis, issued while at Constantinople in 381 as the guest and friend of the bishop of that city, Saint Gregory Nazianzen, and on the eve of becoming secretary of Pope Damasus.

Don Amelli is of opinion that the actual twelfth century codex is a transcription from a much older uncial codex that was written quite near the time of the author. Good palæographical criteria are urged for this view, likewise for the opinion that the manuscript wants something "*ulterius et vehementius*," and is therefore incomplete, a view confirmed by the absence of the usual palæographical signs of manuscript-ending. That the text is the work of Saint

Jerome seems to follow from the peculiar Hieronymian latinity, the critical and exegetical principles it follows, the well-known Hieronymian contention that Origen's interpretation of Isaias VI, 2, is impious, and the quality of the biblical text used. Moreover, Don Amelli believes that the text reveals in its first youthful outburst not only the ardent vivacious style, but the "*præstantiam ingenii animique audaciam*" which are characteristic of Saint Jerome. The opusculum was probably written in Greek. The original transcription of the present text was made by a Greek, or by some one poorly acquainted with Latin, doubtless some Byzantine or Calabrian monk, who copied out mechanically an almost coæval Latin translation that he found in an uncial manuscript, with its absence of word-separation and its ineffaceable evidences of having been taken down *more antiquo* from dictation. If this work be truly (and some yet doubt it) a new treatise of Saint Jerome, then some interesting data for the history of the Church and theology are gained from it. Thus Saint Jerome was an anti-Origenist in 381 and not first in 393; the famous negative definition of God is not first found in Saint Augustine (cf. op. cit., no. 4), but in Saint Jerome, unless both drew it from Clement of Alexandria; the Manichæan heresy was vigorous in New Rome in the latter quarter of the fourth century, hence the Theodosian rigors. Perhaps the most valuable lines of the manuscript are those that touch on the Roman Church. The author in discussing the orders of the angelic hierarchy, refers to the distinction of order in the Apostolic college, and asserts the supreme "*principatus*" of St. Peter.¹

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Die Eschatologie des Buches Job. Von Dr. Jakob Royer. Freiburg: Herder, 1901. Pp. 156. (Biblische Studien, vi, 5.)

Abraham. Von Dr. Paul Dornstetter. Freiburg: Herder, 1902. Pp. 278. (Biblische Studien, vii, 1-3.)

Die Einheit der Apokalypse. Von Dr. Matthias Kohlhofer. Freiburg: Herder. Pp. 143. (Biblische Studien, vii, 4.)

1. There is a perennial fascination in the book of Job, so sublime in its poesy, so poignant in the woe and perplexity of its hero. The author of this monograph has undertaken to see what light is thrown upon the life beyond the grave, by this inspired delineation of a soul wrestling with the problems of human suffering. He has come to the conclusion that Job—which he thinks was the work of Jeremias

¹ Nam et Apostoli cum ignorarent mensuram suam, et nescierunt quis quo major esset, dijudicati sunt a Domino, *Et ita Petro datus est principatus ut unusquisque suum ordinem possideret* (op. cit., no. 7, p. 14).

—teaches not only immortality but also—though somewhat dimly—the continuation after death of the relations of the just with God, and the hope of their release from Sheol. Moreover, Dr. Royer adds another to the expositors who find in the well-known passage (xix, 23–27), the doctrine of the resurrection. Certainly this obscure puzzling text bears this meaning with at least as much probability as others given it. But the last word on the *crux*—if there will be a last word—shall depend on the right view of Job as a whole, and the answer to the queries: is the book a unit, and if so, does its tenor comport with advanced ideas of the future life? There are many who deny one or both. Meanwhile, we have a right to hold to the traditional interpretation. This is strengthened by Dr. Royer's exegesis, but remnants of doubt are still left clinging to it. With the exception of a few ill-founded statements, such as the assertion of a tradition of judgment after death among the Babylonians, Dr. Royer's work is a solid addition to the literature of Job.

2. Must Abraham be relegated to the region of myths? Cornill is alone among the advanced German critics in saying nay. The question is one with which Christian apology is closely concerned, for Israel by the flesh and that of the spirit alike trace their descent from this patriarch. Dr. Dornstetter's 278 pages are not too many for a theme of such importance. He defends the historicity of the Abraham narrative, and has brought a wealth of reading and patient research to his task. He upholds piece by piece, all the details of the history attacked by the adversaries. Most of the discussion centers about names of places, men and tribes. Much space and effort is given to adjusting the biblical chronology with the data of Babylonian and Egyptian discoveries. The author brings into requisition the conclusions of the archaeologists Sayce and Hommel, but their judgment is apt to be warped by their anti-critical stand, and on many points they have the cocksureness justly blamed upon some biblical critics. A copious bibliography ends the book. It is a stanchly conservative essay, but like other of its class, has the fault in seeing but error in the ranks of criticism.

3. The Apocalypse was a stumbling stone to a number of Christian fathers and doctors of the early centuries. Antioch's literal school of exegesis, including Saint John Chrysostom, could make nothing clear or intelligible out of it or the Apocrypha. Its visions and mysteries furnish apt material for heretical vagaries, and this was another cause of its long eclipse in parts of the Orient. Modern biblical criticism has stumbled at this enigmatical book. Not that the critics concern themselves with its inner meaning, but they would

make it a curious patchwork or mixture containing various elements, Jewish, Judeo-Christian, Gnostic or Babylonian, according to the presuppositions or idiosyncrasies of the analyzers. But the marked lack of agreement in their results offers a strong point to the defenders of the book's unity, and strongly suggests much subjectivity in the critical enterprises. In "Die Einheit der Apokalypse" the arguments of the assailants of its unity are scrutinized, and the objections answered in detail, and in general, effectively. In view of a kind of family resemblance between the New Testament book of Revelations and pre-Christian apocalypses or apocalyptic visions, the interesting question suggests itself: is the supernatural character of its visions compatible with an influence of older apocalyptic passages? In other words, did the revelations vouchsafed to St. John at Patmos, before their ultimate perception by him, pass through a medium, formed by his mental state, and in so doing assimilate something of their mental form and color from a fullness of Old Testament and Hebraic thought there. The author does not go into this question though hinting (pp. 65, 66, 70) that some of the images may have been drawn from the older sacred literature. Certainly, the phraseology at least of this book of mysteries savors strongly of the Old Testament.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

The Literature of American History. A Bibliographical Guide, in which the scope, character and comparative worth of books in selected lists are set forth in brief notes by critics of authority. Edited for the Am. Library Association by J. N. Larned. Boston: Houghton, Mifflin & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. ix + 596.

Many hands have contributed to this bibliography of 4,155 numbers. Under the rubrics, America at large, The United States, the United States by Sections, Canada, Spanish and Portugese America, The West Indies, the reader will find a *catalogue raisonné* of a choice library of Americana, drawn up by forty capable scholars, many of them life-long students of the department assigned to their industry. The late Paul Leicester Ford contributes thirteen pages of a syllabus of existing materials for the study of American history that makes excellent reading, even for those who are no longer beginners. Each writer is responsible, over his initials, for the brief characterization of the works he treats. From a Catholic point of view the omissions are many, nor are they slight and unimportant. Thus, no account is taken of the numerous diocesan histories published by Catholics, nor is Finotti's unfinished "Bibliographia Catholica Americana"

mentioned. Possibly we are ourselves somewhat to blame, since the science of bibliography does not count many devotees among us. It would be unfair to pass final judgment on this work as a "Supplement" is promised, that, however, will contain only works published in 1900 and 1901.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Etudes Sur Les Evangiles. Par le Père V. Rose, O.P. Paris: Welter, 1902. Pp. xiv + 336.

This little volume is mainly a reprint of articles, which appeared originally in the *Revue Biblique*. The author is the learned Dominican who fills the chair of exegesis at the University of Fribourg. He defends, in a rigidly critical and scientific manner, the vital truths of the Gospel assailed by the rationalistic criticism of the time. The work is concisely done—indeed, here and there one wishes a greater fullness of the argument—but every impartial reader will acknowledge that it is well done, and that the apologist meets his opponents on their own ground and with their own weapons. The first chapter, *La Tétramorphe*, is a defense of the primitive canonicity of the four Gospels against Harnack's allegations. In the next the credibility of Matthew and Luke's narrative of the supernatural conception is vindicated; the silence of the other evangelists explained. The Kingdom of God is then treated; its spirituality and universality are proven by the words and actions of Jesus. Under the caption, *Le Père Céleste*, the writer deals with the new relations which the Redeemer established between God the Father and mankind. The fifth chapter, *Fils de l'Homme*, discusses the problem of Our Lord's reserve regarding his Messiahship, and contends that the "Son of Man" was a veiled title of the Messiah, significant to those who entered into Christ's idea of the Kingdom. In the next, *Fils de Dieu*, the inner divine nature of the Messiah's person is evinced by the words of Jesus himself, and the pre-temporal character of his Sonship deduced from the testimonies of the evangelists. *La Rédemption* is the title of a chapter devoted to Jesus' virtues, to the expiatory and vicarious nature of his redeeming Act. Finally, in *Le Tombeau trouvé*, Fr. Rose attempts to reconcile the two types of accounts of Christ's apparitions after the Resurrection, and vindicates the historic value of the evidences of this miracle.

Some views enunciated in these *Etudes* have an unfamiliar sound, though they are not hereby condemned. For instance, we are not used to be told by Catholic theologians that Jesus did not proclaim his Messiahship until the end of the Galilean ministry; that the name

"Son of God" as given to our Lord by the celestial voices, the angels, demons and apostles, connotes nothing more than the Messiahship. The Resurrection is retired to a secondary place in Christian evidences. Fr. Rose thinks that he would be but a blundering apologist who would lead an unbeliever to the empty sepulchre, without having prepared his mind by revealing Christ's teaching about himself. The rationalist critics are always adducing the consciousness of Jesus; it is to this that that our author appeals, first of all; it is the foundation of his "apologetic." With a clearness, brevity and perspicacity that leave little to be desired, Father Rose strips Christ's self-testimony, and the witness of the evangelists, of the disguise thrown about them by the adversaries, whom he convicts of error by the voice of their self-chosen tribunal.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

Staatslexicon. Edited by Dr. Julius Bachem. (2d ed.) Freiburg: Herder, 1902. Vol. III, Hegel to Mormonen.

The preceding volumes of this admirable Staatslexicon have been already noticed in the BULLETIN (April, 1902). The third volume contains many very interesting articles which appear in the order required by the German alphabet. We might mention in particular: Kapital und Kapitalismus, Lehrlings und Gesellenwesen, Kartelle, Monopol, Lohn; the biographical sketches of Bishop von Ketteler, Malinckrodt, de Lammenais, Montalembert; and the articles on Kirche und Staat, Liberalismus, Kulturkampf. The entire volume is characterized, as are volumes I and II by methodical exposition, completeness and sufficient bibliographical indications.

The great service that a work like this may render is understood when we note that an intelligent grouping of articles gives one a complete view of all questions within its scope. True, the studies are not exhaustive nor technical. In such a work, they cannot be. But the thoughtful reader will find them complete enough for every general purpose. The dependence of volume on volume and of article on article, prevents one from reviewing single volumes satisfactorily. They will be noticed as they appear. When the final volume is published, a general review of the whole work may be of service. The work merits generous support from the Catholics of the United States who are familiar with German.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Socialism and Labor. By Bishop Spalding. Chicago: A. C. McClurg & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 225.

This new volume by Bishop Spalding is a compilation of some occasional addresses together with a number of chapters which are but remotely related. The variety of the contents makes it necessary to state the titles of chapters, in order that the reader understand the scope of the volume: Socialism and Labor; The Basis of Popular Government; Are We in Danger of Revolution? Charity and Justice; Woman and the Christian Religion; Emotion and Truth; Education and Patriotism; Assassination and Anarchy; Church and Country; Labor and Capital; Work and Leisure; The Mystery of Pain; An Orator and Lover of Justice; St. Bede.

While the personality of the author is the chief bond which gives unity to the work, the multitudes who love to read and who admire whatever Bishop Spalding writes, will be anxious to possess this volume because it is from his pen; and they will find in it the optimism, enthusiasm and hope which characterize him. The chapters "Woman and the Christian Religion," "Emotion and Truth," "Education and Patriotism," "Work and Leisure" and "The Mystery of Pain" are admirable. One would recognize them as the work of the scholarly Bishop of Peoria, no matter where one found them. The chapters on the general phases of the social question present the author to us in a new rôle. One feels at a first reading that these chapters have not taken on the imprint of the author's personality. We are not accustomed to meeting him in the field of statistics and economics. Nevertheless, the treatment of the questions shows a wide acquaintance with the elements of the social problem and an accurate appreciation of the psychological forces in it. There is possibly not much that is new in the treatment, yet all of the author's admirers will heartily welcome this expression of his views and will undoubtedly receive guidance from it.

Chapter XIII, "An Orator and Lover of Justice," is a discussion of the character of Altgeld. Possibly some who followed the political career of this remarkable man will hardly agree with Bishop Spalding's high estimate of Governor Altgeld; but waiving that, the address is a splendid analysis of character and a subtle appreciation of the forces that manifest themselves in the life of a leader.

It may not be out of place to express the hope that Bishop Spalding's work as a member of the Anthracite Coal Strike Commission may later impel him to publish more on the labor question. Meantime, this little volume will not fail to add to his reputation as a public spirited man and a teacher of rare power.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

A Short History of the Christian Church for students and general readers. By John W. Moncrief. Chicago: Fleming H. Revell Company, 1902. 8°, pp. 458.

Some books are reviewed because of intrinsic merit. The only claim of this one to recognition is the position of its author, as Associate Professor of Church History in the University of Chicago. Of course it has some merits. It could hardly fail to have them, coming, as it does, from such a source. But in general, its author has failed to write anything new in thought or method, and has marred his work by an occasional ignorance simply astounding, and a more frequent display of bigotry, which is nothing less than insulting to the Catholic students in the University of Chicago.

In the space at our disposal we can notice only a few points. To begin with the bibliography. It is certainly pretentious, though any of Professor Moncrief's students could have done as well, and doubtless with more modesty, not to say fairness. Catholic sources are rarely mentioned, and always with the adjective "Romanist" or some signal to make the average non-Catholic reader shy of reading them. In fact, one cannot resist the suspicion that the author never read most of the books cited; otherwise it is hard to understand some of the ridiculous views put forth by him. For instance, speaking of monasticism, he puts down the following as its "psychological cause": "The deep desire planted in the soul to escape contamination is universal. This led the heathen to believe that matter and sense are essentially evil—and the Christian to the same conclusion." Merely this and nothing more. Professor Moncrief as a philosopher of history is certainly unique. We do know of a widespread sect, half pagan and half Christian, known as Manichæism, which did hold matter to be essentially evil. But it is news indeed, to learn that the cultured Greek held the same, and downright astounding to find a similar belief attributed to Christians universally, to men and women who believed in a resurrection of the body and condemned Manichæism as a heresy. As for monasticism, has Professor Moncrief ever read of St. Francis of Assisi or St. Catharine of Siena, whose greatest delight was to wander through the fields and pluck wild flowers and talk to the birds and weave garlands of daisies and sing for very joy of being close to nature? Farther on this writer (p. 153) seems less confident in his theory, and so he advances another "psychological cause" no less wonderful: "In monasticism, with all its perversions and later corruptions, we have a foregleam of the Reformation" because it was "a great protest of the individual" against a decaying constitutional church.

By this reasoning then the belief that "matter and sense are essentially evil" was a "foregleam of the Reformation." The author, perhaps, will object to such a logical deduction because (p. 306) he classes "Luther's marriage to Catherine von Bora—an escaped nun" among the notable "events indicating the progress of reform." Surely, there was no contempt of matter in that *affaire du coeur*. And Luther were the last to despise matter or the enjoyment of it whether as "wine, women or song." Speaking of this "idyll" of the Reformation, we offer a suggestion to our author. He commences *Modern Church History* (p. 34) with the "posting of the ninety-five theses" of Luther. Would it not be better to begin it with Catharine's escape from the convent, or at least, with her marriage with Luther? That would have the advantage of linking the Reformation with Monasticism and Manichæism, giving it a logical continuity, so to speak, with antiquity. We trust the reader will not hold us guilty of levity in throwing out this suggestion. Far be it from us to be otherwise than solemn in dealing with such a solemn subject.

Leaving the higher atmosphere of philosophy and coming down to particular facts, we are sorry to hold the author guilty of downright slander. One need only be a gentleman to brand as such the statement concerning the Jesuits (p. 364) that "among their principles we find the following: the end justifies the means." As Catholics, Jesuits could not hold such a principle, and we formally challenge Professor Moncrief to produce evidence that they do. We would not be surprised to read such a slander in a penny Sunday School paper, published in some backwoods village, but we have no words with which to properly express our contempt when finding it printed in a *Church History*, written by an Associate Professor in one of our leading universities. It was our impression that such a style of controversy was out-of-date, but it would seem that civilization among some people has not progressed far enough to make them abandon the use of chain-shot and dumdum bullets in warfare. However much Professor Moncrief may disapprove of Jesuit principles, he ought at least give them the credit of being too wise to be fools, and too upright individually, to hold a principle which is stigmatized by all honorable men of every religious belief.

The author's acquaintance with Catholic doctrine is, to put it mildly, not profound. Even the simplest, most elementary principles of Catholic belief are misinterpreted or unknown. Thus on page 251 we read of "worship of the Blessed Virgin," "Saint worship." Now, no Catholic ever did or does now "worship" anyone

but God. Worship, as used nowadays, means adoration, and Professor Moncrief is strangely ignorant if he does not know so. At least, his wording is ambiguous and misleading.

Likewise (p. 422), he evinces a fundamental ignorance of the meaning of Papal Infallibility, when he triumphantly writes of the decree restoring the Jesuits: "This infallible decree repudiates the infallible decree of Clement XIV (1771) which forbade the restoration of the Jesuits forever." Now this is simply astounding. Any child in a parochial school in Chicago could tell Professor Moncrief that Papal Infallibility concerns only teaching of faith and morals, and not such cases as the actual erection or dissolution of a religious society, which acts are purely disciplinary.

Throughout most of the book, however, the author is not more bigoted than many other Protestant writers of popular text-books. He is merely more than usually ignorant. But in his treatment of modern Catholicity he passes the bounds of decency. Of Leo XIII he thus speaks (p. 427): "As we follow the subtle movements of this pope, and see that when he here and there yields a secondary matter it is only that he may gain a point of greater importance, and when we see him stirring up strife within nations and between nations, with a view to personal advantage, and see, too, his minions going to all the ends of civilization," etc. Then of Rome in general, "we reluctantly admit the truth of Rector Schwab's statement in his introduction to Nippold's *Papacy in the Nineteenth Century* 'True; we need no longer fear bodily harm. . . . But are there not other considerations. . . . Is not the possibility of national decay something to care about? The danger from the Church of Rome to-day is not the stake or torture; but it is the danger from insidious moral and spiritual forces threatening to stop a nation's progress, to corrupt a nation's ethical standard, to darken a nation's intellect. The greatest task which God has appointed to the religious forces of this country is to build up a government in city, state and nation which shall be pure and just; and the papal system is the most determined enemy to the accomplishment of this task.' " These are incendiary utterances, and they bring this manual beneath the ordinary level of its kind.

At the sight of such ignorance and bigotry in the person of an associate professor of the University of Chicago, one cannot help asking himself if this be the best product of Chicago culture. The dedication to Eri Baker Hulbert, Professor of History in the same university, whom the author admiringly terms his "faithful friend and wise counsellor," would suggest that the department of history

in general was not unsympathetic, even though the average of scholarship might be higher than that displayed by the author.

However, this may be, one thing is clear, to wit, that Catholic students in the University of Chicago would do well to select their courses with discrimination; or still better, to attend a Catholic university, where they can be sure of not hearing their faith slandered and of making a more reliable course in ecclesiastical history than would seem to be accessible on the shores of Lake Michigan.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

First Lessons in the Science of the Saints. By R. J. Meyer, S.J. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 320.

Practical Preaching for Priests and People (Second Series): Twenty-five Plain Catholic Sermons on Useful Subjects, with a Synopsis of Each Sermon. By Fr. Clement Holland. London: Thomas Baker, 1902. Pp. 422.

Forty-five Sermons, Written to Meet Objections of the Present Day. By Rev. James McKernan. New York and Cincinnati: Fr. Pustet & Co., 1902. Pp. 291.

Earth to Heaven. By Monsignor John Vaughan. St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 184.

1. Father Meyer's position of prominence and authority in the Society of Jesus bespeaks for his new volume a respectful attention. Upon examination the reader will find his anticipations realized. These pages give abundant evidence of faithful study of approved spiritual teachers, of close acquaintance with the vagaries of human character, and of a zealous longing to inspire ordinary Christians with the ambition of holiness. The volume is adapted to reach about the same class of readers as that to which Father Faber's writings were addressed; the subjects treated are the ones usually touched upon in Retreat Conferences, Treatises on Perfection, Manuals of the Virtues, and the like; but while the writer may be said to resemble Father Faber in directness, in earnestness and in general temper, his plainness is in contrast with the poetic fervor and adornment of the popular Oratorian's writings. The chapters are supplied with ample proof of doctrinal soundness, in the form of references to such authorities as St. Ignatius, St. Francis de Sales, St. Thomas and Suarez. Simple language, a fairly interesting style and a mildy philosophic tone, form characteristics that should encourage the prospective reader.

2. An admirable point about Father Holland's Sermons—a characteristic that will recommend the book especially to a busy, quick-thinking priest—is the little synopsis that stands at the head of each discourse. As to the sermons themselves, there is a good deal of practical common sense interwoven with the treatment of the moral and doctrinal subjects, some of the sermons being composed quite in the missionary's vein. In point of elegance they yield the palm to other compositions, but, of course, they have been directed to the attainment of a more practical end than the production of elaborately constructed periods.

3. Father McKernan's contribution of forty-five sermons should be a useful acquisition to both priests and laity. The author has paid almost exclusive attention to objections nowadays current against the faith; over against the positions and the arguments of those who assail or doubt Catholic doctrines he places the Church's teaching and the reasons that support it. Brevity, simplicity and ardent faith are apparent in his pages. It is in the devotional sermons, however, that his best work seems to have been done. One notices with some regret the lack of a devotional sermon on the Blessed Sacrament, though—perhaps in compensation—there is a good one on the Holy Name. Oftentimes a careful and fervent exhortation on the Blessed Sacrament will profit both the good and the bad, both the faithful and the unbeliever, far more than a most learned discourse in proof of transsubstantiation.

4. In Mgr. Vaughan's sermons one discovers a very noticeable concern as to matters rhetorical. We make this comment not by way of reproach but rather as a commendation. For though he does not always succeed in escaping the pitfalls that beset the "fine writer," yet he does attain to a varied excellence that furthers him in his endeavor to fix attention upon the doctrinal truths he is exposing. His language is figurative, lively, vivid; he employs entertaining allusions and illustrations; he is brief, positive and clear. It is in the non-controversial sermons, however, that he appears to be most successful; his genius runs rather to explanation than to argument; he preaches more effectively than he demonstrates. In the preface contributed by the Bishop of Emmaus are some rather unintelligible sentences due no doubt to an oversight in the proof-reading.

J. MCSORLEY.

ST. THOMAS COLLEGE,
CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY.

The Harmony of the Religious Life. By Herman J. Heuser.
New York: Benziger Bros., 1902. 8°, pp. —.

Father Heuser's book is intended for religious belonging to teaching communities. It is constructed in the manner of an elaborate allegory wherein the religious life and virtues are conceived as an organ built to give melodious expression to worship of the Most High. This novel conveyance for the ever-old lessons of humility, patience, poverty and obedience, serves its purpose admirably. It appeals to one with something of the quaintness, force and picturesqueness of an Oriental parable, and recalls the wisdom of the householder who has at command both new things and old. The latter pages of the book are taken up with counsels of Christian pedagogy. For these alone, we should have to thank the author for a good, strong, stimulating work. Fortunate it will be for the great host of children now in our parochial schools, if they are given the wholesome training for which Father Heuser makes a plea. Fortunate, too, those teachers who will assimilate the deep and truly spiritual principles which he lays down for the accomplishing of what he calls "a continuous creation through the action of the Divine Spirit," the unfolding of the natural faculties and supernatural possibilities which God has hidden in the mind and heart of a child.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY.

The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus, Patriarch of Alexandria, in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis. Edited and translated by E. W. Brooks, M.A. Vol. I (Text), Part I. London and Oxford: published for the Text and Translation Society by Williams and Norgate, 1902. Pp. ix + 259.

The Text and Translation Society, established for the purpose of editing and translating the Oriental Texts chiefly preserved at the British Museum, issues as the first number of its series of publications an edition of the sixth book of the select letters of Severus of Antioch (539) in the Syriac version of Athanasius of Nisibis (684). This edition is the work of E. W. Brooks, a scholar already will known for his excellent contributions to Syriac literature. The present volume contains Part I of the Syriac text, the English translation of which will appear about Easter. Part II of the text and Part II of the translation will be published in as quick succession as possible, and an introduction dealing with the work of Severus will follow with the translation.

The Letters of Severus of Antioch, lost except for a few fragments in Greek, are preserved in at least three Syriac versions; of these,

two are represented by a few isolated letters or fragments; but of the third, that of Athanasius of Nisibis, the sixth book is found almost complete in two Syriac MSS. of the British Museum, viz. Add. 12181 and Add. 14600, both of the eighth century. Brooks' edition is based on these two MSS., to which he refers as A, B, respectively. Variant readings are given from Add. 12154 of the British Museum (about A. D. 800), and from Cod. Paris Syr. 62 of the ninth century. The Greek fragments which are extant are also published in full.

The first part of the text contains, besides the Syriac preface and headings, 66 letters, 63 in Section I (pp. 1-221) and 3 in Section II (pp. 222-231). These letters throw considerable light on the work and influence of Severus of Antioch whom Tillemont calls "the second founder of the Eutychian heresy (*Mémoires*, XVI, 682). They certainly confirm what we know of his opposition to Nestorianism (p. 42), and of his bitter hatred towards St. Flavian of Antioch, to whom he refers as "a trafficker in divine things" (p. 145). Seven of the letters are addressed to different parties in Apamea, and two to the archimandrite of Mar Bassus, a monastery which was a hotbed of Monophysitism in the first quarter of the sixth century. The majority of the letters deal with points of ecclesiastical discipline; such is the letter of Philoxenus of Mabbôgh (No. 48) asking his advice as to whether those who had received ordination in consideration of temporal gifts should be granted absolution, upon their plea of ignorance of the canons, the letter to Eustace the presbyter (No. 35) telling him that a slave cannot be ordained priest, until he has secured his freedom, the letter to Dionysius of Tarsus (No. 33) advising him to act leniently with a priest who was possessed of the devil, but not to allow him to minister at the altar. This suffices to show the wide range of topics covered by the letters as well as their importance for the student of Church History. Mr. Brooks is entitled to the gratitude of all scholars for placing within their reach the hitherto inaccessible letters of Severus of Antioch. Taking this volume as an index of those that will follow, we may bespeak a hearty welcome to the future publications of the Text and Translation Society.

ARTHUR VASCHALDE.

The Relation of Experimental Psychology to Philosophy. By Mgr. Désiré Mercier. Translated by Rev. Edmund J. Wirth, Ph.D., D.D. New York: Benziger Bros., 1902. Pp. 62.

Dr. Wirth gives us in this little volume an English version of a lecture delivered before the Royal Belgian Academy by the well-known professor of philosophy in the University of Louvain. Both

the original and the translation are useful; they place before a large circle of readers the real value of a science which has not always been looked on with favor by adherents of the spiritualistic philosophy. Although it was not possible within the limits of a lecture to thoroughly discuss any of the problems at issue, the principal points of contact between experimental results and philosophical principles are clearly indicated. The general conclusion is that experimental psychology, far from justifying the materialistic position "widens the road of progress for true philosophy and furnishes it with valuable information." It is interesting to read this verdict from one who is a recognized authority on Scholasticism; and, doubtless, the result for many minds will be that surpassing peace which is desirable. At the same time, it would be worth while asking just why so much "valuable information" should be of the important sort, and why the true philosophy should be content to follow scientific movements which are inaugurated under foreign auspices.

E. A. PAGE.

The Middle Ages. Philip Van Ness Myers. New York: Ginn & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. vi + 454.

Mr. Myers possesses in a marked degree the art of book-making, *i. e.*, the art of making a book so attractive that it is a pleasure to read it, nay even to look at it, to feel it. He knows the best kind of paper and binding and print; just where to place a map or a footnote; his ability to pack a whole century into a few pages and do it well is marvellous. And though he is not learned and makes many blunders he has that rare knack of picking out the chief events—movements from the tangled web of history—and presenting them free from minor events which might tend to confuse the reader. Then too he hits upon very excellent books in his bibliographical notes, though his own text does not show great research. In this, one of his numerous books, all these excellent qualities are found in an unusual degree. It is one of those little histories which one keeps around him for quick reference, because he is always sure of finding what he wants quickly and said clearly. From a controversial point of view we should call the work moderate. Occasionally things are said offensively, nor is the author always correct in his statements as to Catholic positions. But such blunders are due more to ignorance than ill will. Because, as above said, Mr. Myers is not and does not pretend to be scientific. His aim is to compile a tolerably correct, fair and very readable work, and we must say he has succeeded in doing so.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

Œuvres Oratoires de Bossuet. Edition critique complète, par l'abbé J. Lebarq, Docteur es-lettres, Vol. I-VII. Lille: Desclée De Brouwer et Cie, 1890-1897. 8°. 38 francs.

Our readers will scarcely be displeased that, somewhat tardily it is true, we bring to their knowledge this valuable publication of the late abbé Lebarq. It seems incredible that for the first time the sermons of Bossuet lie before us in a text as like as possible to that which he wrote or preached. It seems still more incredible that so little remains—two hundred and thirty-five sermons—of the fifty-four years of his magisterial preaching (1648-1702). Nevertheless, we welcome these precious volumes that contain the output of the most sublime of modern Christian minds, a mind very clear, simple and logical, that seemed bathed always in an atmosphere of doctrinal intelligence and elevation. He was one of the makers of that great weapon of human activity—the French language. In his hands it was made to express with precision and fulness whatever was true, pure, universal, of general human interest. He created the language of philosophical history, and, first since St. Augustine, outlined with massive strength and perfect sense of proportion, a consistent philosophy of history. He is truly the Michael Angelo of history, before whose vision only the majestic, the grandiose, the divine, find favor, whose spirit seems always touched with an apocalyptic fire, that shines in his phrase with celestial warmth and sweetness.

In his life time only one sermon appeared with his full approbation, that on the Unity of the Church, preached at the opening of the famous Assembly of 1682. Already, indeed, his six great funeral orations had been printed, but under pressure from the Court; a seventh, that on Anne of Austria, seems lost forever. Not until 1772-1778 was a complete collection of his sermons printed by the Benedictine Deforis, from manuscripts that had come down in the family of Bossuet. The methods and principles of this edition—whose content, strangely enough, has never been increased—were very faulty from the view-point of modern exact scholarship. Nor is the edition of 1815 to be regarded as superior. The Lachat edition (1862-1864) furnished M. Lebarq with no little material for criticism in his "*Histoire Critique de la prédication de Bossuet*" (Paris, 1889). In the partial editions of Gandar, Gazier, Brunetière, Rébelliau, judgment and science seem to have dealt, for the first time, with the text of the Eagle of Meaux. The editions of Bar-le-Duc (1870) Paris (1870-74) Lyons (1877) have no merit of their own—M. Lebarq declares them "replicas" in various proportions of the editions of 1815, Gandar and Lachat.

Each sermon in this edition, is placed in its historical "milieu." Philosophical and historical notes accompany the text. Besides a useful introduction there are several pages on the grammar of Bossuet. A seventh volume contains a complete index, and each volume is provided with a concordance that permits comparison with all previous editions. The volumes are printed in large and fresh type, and offer also specimens of the handwriting of Bossuet, as well as portraits of the great orator. Five of the volumes contain his sermons before 1670. One is sufficient for all that is left of the active episcopal life of Bossuet from 1670 to 1704; a space of thirty-four years. What would we not give for the full content of those years, his sermons at Meaux, in the villages of his diocese, to his priests and nuns, the occasional discourses of so varied a calling! Henceforth, the sermons of Bossuet must be read and cited in this edition. It is a monument put up by the nineteenth century to the memory of one who has been called, nor without reason "the last of the fathers."

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Letters of St. Teresa. Translated from the Spanish by the Rev. John Dalton. London: Thomas Baker, 1 Soho Square, 1902. 8°, pp. 304.

The value of private letters as a means of effecting intimate acquaintance with historic personages had been remarked time and again—never more truly than in the case of Saint Teresa. Without her letters the Autobiography and the Book of Foundations lose their significance in great measure; with them we are able to penetrate far into the saint's personality, to realize the details of her wonderful career, to appreciate accurately her mental keenness, her splendid business talent, her quick wit, her affectionate disposition, her striking bravery. A sense of all this no doubt has coöperated with personal reverence and scholarly zeal in suggesting those painstaking careful researches, which in recent years have revealed so much that is new with regard to the text and the significance of Saint Teresa's Letters.

A complete enumeration of the various editions and translations of this work, while not without interest, would be rather to take us too far afield. Let us remind ourselves, however, that not until 1657 did the public receive the first Spanish edition—one painfully incomplete and containing but 65 letters. By 1748 such advance had been made that a French translation of 107 letters then appeared, and a little later, a more careful edition was made at Madrid, thanks to the labor of a committee of three appointed by the general of the

Discalced Carmelites in Spain. Until very recently the best known French translations have been the three volumes of Migne (1840-1845) and those of P. Bouix, S.J. (1861 and 1882). In 1900 appeared a new edition increased by some 70 new Letters and some 400 fragments never before published in French, due to the scholarly researches of Father Gregory of Saint Joseph, Discalced Carmelite.

As to the English translations, one containing seventy letters was put forth by Father Dalton of Northampton in 1853. For reasons unknown, it was never followed up by succeeding volumes as readers had been led to hope. This volume was re-edited in 1893 and again in 1902; its reimpression has suggested the present notice. The publication will be regarded with mingled feelings of satisfaction and annoyance by everyone familiar with the writings of Saint Teresa. The contents of the book of course, are full of charm, interest and endless inspiration, yet that this volume should be published in its present form is nothing less than an outrage upon our sense of propriety and a sad reflection upon our literary zeal. The plates appear to be new, some misprints at least have been rectified, and the book is sold cheaply—but beyond that, absolutely no consulting of public interest seems to have been attempted. In the edition of 1893 "Suarez" was written down "Saurez" and "Saurez" he still remains. By some unmistakable oversight the old edition repeated a letter first as No. VIII, and again as No. XXII—not even that easily discovered error has been rectified. There is not the slightest evidence of any use of recently acquired information. The publication before us certainly will effect good; our sincere wish is that its fruit may be multiplied a hundredfold: while it remains the only attainable edition of Saint Teresa's Letters, surely English-speaking Catholics cannot help feeling stung to shame.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY.

ST. THOMAS' COLLEGE.

Poems of Ovid: Selections. Edited by Charles W. Bain. New York: The Macmillan Co. Pp. xiv + 461.

The justification for adding this latest accession to the already rather numerous editions of Ovid is found, as the editor says "in the growing demand for some easier poetry than Vergil's in the earlier years of Latin reading. It has long been felt, indeed, that Vergil's syntax, vocabulary and scansion require a much surer knowledge, and consequently a longer acquaintance with the Latin tongue than the first years can possibly afford. Hence, if the courses in Latin poetry are to be orderly, that is progressive from the less

to the more difficult, some reading, not quite beyond the young mind, must be substituted in the earlier years. Now the poems of Ovid, in the opinion of Mr. Bain, are the best preparation for Vergil. Their form and content are not beyond the beginner's grasp, and in addition the "Metamorphoses," filled with myth and fable, are well calculated to attract and hold the attention of the young, "and at the same time to clear the way for the more arduous work to come."

The volume under discussion is then, essentially, a preparatory school edition. It is made up of about four thousand verses, three thousand of which are carefully annotated, the remaining one thousand, intended for rapid reading, are also accompanied with a brief commentary. The text followed is that of A. Riese in his critical edition of 1889. The editor, Mr. Bain, claims the capitalization and punctuation as his own. In addition to the commentary, with its careful solution of grammatical problems and its lucid exposition of dark mythological lore, the volume is further enriched with numerous illustrations, a full vocabulary and a list of word-groups, from which list it is expected that the scholar will be enabled to retain the words most frequently occurring, because their rendition will be the result of his own intelligent effort. It seems, however, that the same end could be attained more easily and with quite as much profit by requiring the young student to commit to memory selected and interpreted passages. Language is not learned entirely by grouping together radically related words, and then memorizing them. The appreciation of word-collocation in the Latin sentence is of importance in determining with accuracy the meaning of its verbal constituents. Besides words are related syntactically as well as radically. And the memory of phrases and construction actually occurring will do much to dispel that very vagueness which of necessity attaches to radical elements.

That the volume is the result of considerable experience in the class-room is evident, both from the commentary and from the selections chosen. It cannot therefore but prove helpful to the teacher and scholar who have the pleasant task of reading the lines of "Rome's sweet sad singer."

JOHN D. MAGUIRE.

The Teaching of Latin and Greek, in the Secondary School. By Charles E. Bennett, A.B., and George P. Bristor, A.M., Professor in Cornell University. New York: Longmans, Green & Co., 1901. Pp. xvi + 330.

In the initial chapter of this welcome contribution to Latin and Greek pedagogics, Professor Bennett takes the following position:

Language is the supreme instrument of education; by language is meant the study of one's own language, which is achieved incomparably better by the indirect method of studying another language. In the present instance, this other language is Latin. Professor Bennett's analysis of the process of mental gymnastics through which the student of Latin must inevitably pass is thorough—all that could be desired. He quotes from President Eliot,¹ and then points out clearly and logically how the proper study of Latin contributes in an eminent degree to the four essential processes or operations of the educated mind: viz., "observing accurately; recording correctly; comparing, grouping, inferring justly; and expressing the result of these operations with clearness and force."

Professor Bennett is undoubtedly right in maintaining that "Training in the Vernacular" is the first and most important reason for studying Latin." This proposition is well substantiated by citing the testimony of Cicero, who declares in his "De Optimo genere oratorum" that he found careful translation from Greek into Latin a very useful exercise. His quotations from Lowell and Dettweiler are also apropos in confirmation of the above statement. Indeed, the great Cardinal Newman owed no small share of his command over the English language to his constant study of Cicero, of whom he could truly say as Dante said of Vergil, "My Master, thou, and guide."

Professor Bennett states his case clearly and his positive proofs are conclusive. His negative proofs, however, or his discussion of Latin *vs.* Modern Languages, will scarcely carry conviction. He gives two reasons for giving Latin a decided preference to either French or German. First the ideas and concepts of the Latin language are *remoter* from those of English than the ideas and concepts of the modern languages. This argument, if pushed to its logical conclusion, would lead to the substitution of Greek for Latin, and perhaps, of Sanskrit for either Greek or Latin. Remoteness of ideas and concepts is a rather weak plea in the question at issue. Besides, the statement, "all modern thought is essentially kindred," will hardly pass the pickets of accuracy. The second reason urged in favor of Latin as compared with the modern languages, is that Latin has supplied us with so large a share of our own vocabulary. These two reasons combined are slightly contradictory. Remoteness and contiguity generally exclude each other. His argument drawn from experience and his reply to Herbert Spencer, to Balin and to the less radical Frederick Paulsen, are decidedly stronger and more accurate than his two theoretical reasons for preferring Latin to French or

¹ "American Contributions to Civilization," p. 203 ff.

German as an instrument of secondary education. Professor Bennett criticizes what he styles the "Typical Beginner's Book of To-day."

The student's hard work is apparently lessened by these books, but as a result "pupils to-day are conspicuously inferior in the mastery of their inflections to the pupils of twenty-five years ago, as well as conspicuously inferior in their general familiarity with the Latin Grammar." The alleged overtraining of the memory has its sad consequences. In a chapter on Roman Pronunciation, Professor Bennett states the incontrovertible evidence for the same as taught at present in most of our American schools and colleges, and then strongly advocates its immediate removal. The experience of his last fifteen years in the class-room has led him to the conclusion that the Roman Pronunciation is a labyrinth of difficulties and yields no profit for the amount of time spent in its acquisition. His criticisms are not mere assertions; they do not end with the bitterness of the moment. Remedies are carefully pointed out and practical suggestions offered for the betterment of the situation. His plea for the return of Vergil's Eclogues to the class-room cannot fail to elicit the sympathy of every teacher who appreciates those consummate translations and imitations of the Idyls of Theocritus. Professor Bennett's reflections, suggestions and assertions on the subject under consideration are supported by years of experience. Young teachers will find an admirable guide in this contribution to modern pedagogics; and though many of the author's statements will not pass unchallenged, every teacher may glean a few useful hints from the "Teaching of Latin in the Secondary Schools."

J. J. TRAHEY.

HOLY CROSS COLLEGE.

School Administration in Municipal Government. By Frank

Rollins, Ph.D. Vol. XI, No. 1, Columbia University Contributions to Philosophy, Psychology and Education. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 106.

Within the brief pages of this brochure, the author points out many of the difficulties encountered by the village school in its rapid development into the municipal school system. Much of his information is derived from personal correspondence with "superintendents and other school officers in all the cities of the United States numbering more than one hundred inhabitants, and in an equal number of cities having a population of nearest to fifty thousand."

On the basis of this information, there is a brief treatment of such questions as The Right and the Need of the State's Interference in the Control of the City School; The Necessity of Separating

School Administration from other Departments of Municipal Government to the end that the School may be Wholly Removed from the Influence of Politics; Sources of Appointment; Qualifications and Tenure of Office of Members of the School Board, Superintendents, Principals, Teachers and Janitors. The author also calls attention to the need felt in every city of stimulating local interest in the school, and to the methods adopted in Brookline, Mass., St. Paul, Minn., and some other cities, to meet this need. Finally, the author discusses, briefly and on a purely theoretical basis, the peculiar advantages for social education offered by the schools of a great city.

It is to be regretted that the scope of Dr. Rollins' work did not permit him to address his questions to representative grade teachers in the various cities. The grade teachers' point of view on many of the questions at issue, is well worth considering. The recent work of the Chicago grade teachers in compelling the owners of municipal franchises to pay their taxes, and in securing initiative referendum legislation, is such a conspicuous illustration of the power of the grade teacher as a factor in social education as well as in municipal reform, that the absence of any mention of this work by Dr. Rollins will be regretted by many readers of his very instructive brochure.

THOMAS E. SHIELDS.

Etudes Bibliques. Par Alfred Loisy. Paris: Picard et Fils, 1901. 8°, pp. 160.

This little book—a second and enlarged edition—is important out of all proportion to its size. It is a generalization of the author's biblical studies, comprising the results of his labors, and a plea for their acceptance or at least for their toleration. It may be called M. Loisy's apology; better, the apology of the advanced school of French Catholic exegetes, of which the Abbé is the most distinguished and most outspoken representative. Courage, bordering on temerity, critical acumen and literary talent, have made the former professor of the Institut Catholique of Paris and the present instructor in Comparative Religion at the Sorbonne, a strong factor and storm-center in the present renaissance of critical theology in France.

M. Loisy is fortunate in his style. Being French, it is of course lucid. This language offers, in general, a cool, calm march of ideas, an exact harmony of thought and expression, and an absence of technicality and learned apparatus, which unite to make a model literary medium for the savant and critic, who wishes to make himself intelligible outside the circle of the initiated few. As much as

any living master of the language, M. Loisy has the rare and potent gift of clothing scientific thought in popular form.

It is well known that the Abbé Loisy is a keen critic, and at the same time one convinced that what is to many a revolutionary biblical criticism is nowise irreconcilable with Catholic faith, but on the contrary is a gain for the truth and a necessary arm for the successful defence of the written Word. Though a believer in the existence of "relative truths" in the Bible—a term which on its reverse side spells relative errors—M. Loisy holds that for Catholics to discuss the question of inerrancy from a purely theological point of view is irritating and inconclusive. He wishes the opposing schools to seek in Catholic criticism mutual reconciliation and a point of union against the forces of unbelief. He sagaciously remarks that while Catholic scholars are quarreling over the *crux* of biblical inerrancy, rationalism is making formidable assaults upon the authority of the Bible as a whole. "Il ne s'agit plus de savoir si la Bible contient des erreurs, mais bien de savoir ce que la Bible contient de vérité. 'Que vaut la Bible?' Telle est la question que l'exégèse non catholique fait retentir à nos oreilles par un si grand nombre de voix qu'il n'est plus en notre pouvoir de ne pas l'entendre. Nous devons opposer à la science rationaliste la science catholique de l'Ecriture."

The fourth gospel is a favorite study of M. Loisy and it is the one in which he shows the greatest originality of mind. Yet he disclaims entire novelty here, as he finds in the attitude of Christian fathers and a few old expositors towards St. John's gospel and other Scriptures, at least the principles which he develops and applies so strikingly and sometimes with luminous effect. The question of authenticity is not directly treated; it has a secondary importance in the writer's eyes. The learned critic seems to still cherish some reserves on this point and is not an outspoken adherent of the traditional authorship. He is also rather non-committal on the delicate matters of the seeming variations between St. John and the synoptists, and the historicity of the former, though it is evident enough that he thinks that historical completeness and chronological order are subordinated to the evangelist's doctrinal purpose.

M. Loisy is least reserved and most satisfactory in his characterization of John's spirit and method. The gospel is symbolic and mystic. The evangelist's principle is that our Lord's actions and words are full of deep-lying meaning. He selects certain miracles and acts of the desired symbolic import and completes them by the Saviour's words. The words and deeds elucidate each other; but

the form of the discourse is St. John's, who in the course of years has re-conceived the Gospel of Jesus, and translates its symbols into a language and form which are drawn from his own mind and spiritual consciousness, while ever expressing the Gospel of Jesus. In other words, the fourth evangel is an inspired interpretation, whose terms were neither revealed nor dictated, but sprang spontaneously from the evangelist's thought, "qui est comme la conscience de l'église chrétienne." M. Loisy has closely studied this difficult but fascinating book. It seems to the reviewer that he has laid his finger upon the key to one of its greatest problems.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Les Infiltrations Kantiennes et Protestantes et le Clergé Français, Etudes Complémentaires. Par J. Fontaine, S.J. Paris: Retaux, 1902. 8°, pp. 437.

Letters from a Self-Made Merchant to his Son. Boston: Small, Maynard & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 312.

The Katipunan. An illustrated historical and biographical study of the society which brought about the Insurrection of 1896-1898 and 1899, taken from Spanish State Documents; The Katipunan or The Rise and Fall of the Filipino Commune by Francis St. Clair. Manila: Tip. Amigos del Pais. Palacio 258, 1902. 16°, pp. 335.

Vexata Quæstio, or what shall we do with the Friar? A brief sketch of three Centuries of History in the Philippines. By W. Brecknock Watson. Manila: *ibid.*, 1901. 8°, pp. 44.

A New Catechism of Christian Doctrine and Practice. By Rt. Rev. James Belford, D.D. Notre Dame, Ind.: The Ave Maria, 1902. 8°, pp. 115.

The Living Church and the Living God. By Rev. Charles Coppens, S.J. New York: Benziger, 1902. 8°, pp. 32.

The Wage of Gerald O'Rourke, Christmas Drama in three Acts. Transposed by M. R. Thiele from a story by Francis J. Finn, S.J. New York: Benziger, 1902. 8°, pp. 47.

Storia e Pregio dei Libri Corali Officiali, Studio del Sac. F. X. Haberl. Rome: Pustet, 1902. 8°, pp. 69.

L'Uso del Canto Gregoriano tradizionale, etc. Rome: Pustet, 1902. 8°, pp. 43.

- The Accadians of Madawaska, Maine. By Rev. C. W. Collins. Boston: 1902. 8°, pp. 66. (N. E. Cath. Hist. Society Publications, no. 3.)
- Memorial of the Most Reverend Michael Augustine Corrigan, D.D., Third Archbishop of New York. Compiled and published by authority. New York: The Cathedral Library Association, 1902. 8°, pp. xii + 234.
- La Question Biblique chez les Catholiques de France au XIX^e Siecle. Par Albert Houtin. 2d ed. Paris: Picard, 1902. 8°, pp. 378.
- Un peuple antique au pays de Ménélék: Les Galla (dits d'origine gauloise), Grande Nation Africaine. 2d edition. Par le R. P. Martial de Salviac. Paris: H. Oudin, 1902. 8°, pp. 353.
- Die Mission und Ausbreitung des Christenthums in den ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Von Ad. Harnack, Leipzig: Hinrichs, 1902. 8°, pp. 561.
- Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbôgh (485-519). Edited from Syriac Manuscripts in the Vatican Library. Rome: 1902. 8°, pp. 190. (Catholic University Dissertation.)
- Jean-Marie de La Mennais (1780-1860). Par le R. P. Laveille. Paris: Poussielque, 1903. 8°, pp. 551, 680.
- Julien l' Apostat. Vols. II-III. Par Paul Allard. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 8°, pp. 376, 416.
- Santa Cecilia e la sua basilica nel Trastevere, Note di critica, del Sac. Dr. V. Bianchi-Cagliesi. Rome: Pustet, 1902. 8°, pp. 89.

THE UNIVERSITY AND THE APOSTOLIC DELEGATE.

On Thursday, December 8, feast of the Immaculate Conception, the Apostolic Delegate visited the University, and was welcomed by the entire body. He assisted at the Solemn Pontifical Mass sung by the Rt. Rev. Rector, and afterward imparted to all present the Papal Benediction. There were present at the dinner many distinguished guests, among them Mgr. Donatus Sbarretti, Apostolic Delegate to Canada, Very Rev. Mgr. F. Z. Rooker, secretary of the Delegation, and Rev. Dr. D. J. Stafford, of St. Patrick's Church. Toward the end of the banquet the Rt. Rev. Rector rose and extended to the Delegate a formal welcome to his new office:

Address of the Rt. Rev. Rector.—*Your Excellency:* We appreciate the great honor conferred upon the University by your willingness to visit it at the very opening of your career among us and to take part in the solemnities of our Patronal Feast. We are deeply sensible of the kindness which thus expresses your interest in the University, the work of which is so important and far-reaching. In union with all the Catholics of the United States we cordially welcome you as the Apostolic Delegate, the representative of the Holy See among us. In your appointment there appears a new proof of the solicitude of the Sovereign Pontiff for the welfare of the Church in our beloved country. It is a strengthening of the tie which binds us to the center of spiritual authority, and bids us feel anew that in the person of the Delegate we have the close watchfulness and tender care of the Father of the Faithful, whom the whole world loves. This University extends to your Excellency a special greeting with the fondness of a special affection. You are the representative of its founder Leo XIII. Anxious for the higher education of clergy and laity, immediately and lovingly responding to the earnest desire of the American Hierarchy, our illustrious Pontiff clothed this institution with the character of a Pontifical University, and its aims and purposes are set forth in its Pontifical Constitutions. It holds also a charter from the District of Columbia.

It was eminently proper that the hospitality of the University made it for a time the home of the first Delegate, when that friendship began which has always characterized the relations between the Apostolic Delegation and the University. Confided to the fostering care of the Bishops and under the kindly supervision of the Delegate, the University carries on its work successfully. It seeks his advice and relies on his guidance and counsel with the same confidence in which any Pontifical institution in Rome relies on the direction of the Holy Father.

Its one desire has been ever to realize the hopes of its illustrious Founder, never failing to respond to the best instincts of the Catholic heart, and unflinchingly faithful to the received traditions of Catholic truth. The mustard seed planted a little more than a decade ago is reaching forth into the trunk and branches of a mighty tree. What was then a waste of farm land is now a vast university settlement. Buildings, magnificent in their proportions, have been erected by the munificent generosity of our Catholic men and women; faculties have been established in which are found, as teachers, men whose scholarship is recognized in Catholic and non-Catholic academic circles, and whose writings are valuable contributions to the world's store of knowledge. Among them, too, are many young men who once were students in their departments, and who are now acquiring fame by their instructions and writings; priests and laymen from all sections of our country have followed the courses, seeking for the degrees which mark the higher scholarship, and which entitle them to the positions of trust now held by them in Church and State.

Many religious institutes appreciating the benefits of the University have placed their scholasticates in a cluster about it, and here have been trained many who fill with honor the places of administrators and teachers in their colleges.

A large body of influential teachers in New York has asked for university direction and instruction in work of pedagogy and, notwithstanding the exactions of university departments, this work is being done with credit and success under the direction of our professors in the great city of New York.

This is but an outline of what the University is doing, and has done, for the higher Christian education. All this means sacrifice, privations, generosity, unselfishness on the part of the men who have contributed their thought and energy to the educational upbuilding of this institution. Men sometimes fail to recognize that the University is in its youth, and that not much more than a dozen years have passed over its head; that like all new institutions it has had to prove

itself worthy of confidence; that it has had to enter into competition with long organized and well endowed universities. Notwithstanding all this the name of the Catholic University is one of honor and renown. The number of its students may be small when compared with collegiate institutions, yet it is well to remember that it is not a seminary nor a college, nor has it the attractions in many departments of professional or semi-professional instruction. Alone it stands in our country to-day as an institution doing graduate work without collegiate classes. To its credit be it said that its students form a very large proportion of Catholic graduates who, outside of professional schools, enter into the higher educational courses. Its numbers must necessarily be limited, yet while it seeks numbers, it is not to be condemned for the lack of numbers. It is to be judged by the scope of its work, as defined by those who interpret its pontifical Constitutions and its University aims and purposes, as well as by the conditions which surround the Catholic graduate body seeking the higher education outside of professionalism. With its limited equipment it has indeed done wonders. Give it the years of its associates, give it an endowment in keeping with its needs, and its record will be worthy of the Pontiff who laid its foundation.

With the full appreciation of the work that is being done by our Catholic colleges, the University has hitherto declined to enter the field of collegiate work. In consequence it has no large body of undergraduate students such as swell the registers of the older and richer American universities, nor can it have such while it remains faithful to its purely graduate character. A very small percentage of Catholic students is found in non-Catholic post-graduate institutions, but it must be remembered that many of these young men have pursued their undergraduate courses in these same institutions; that many others are there because the school is near their homes, while to some there is the attraction which comes from the social advantages which such schools are thought to possess.

It is difficult to conceive that a Catholic college should act as a feeder to non-Catholic universities, and yet, disguise it as we may, this must eventually be the case, unless there be developed here, under the auspices of the Church, a fully equipped university, in which the layman as well as the ecclesiastic shall find every facility for doing professional and scientific work. If we read the constitutions granted to it by the Sovereign Pontiff we cannot fail to recognize that such indeed is the scope of the Catholic University as planned and outlined in them. This motive is the source also of the generosity of the Catholic laity, who in the foundation of its professorships, had

in mind the securing of a Catholic education for lay students as well as for clerics. And this becomes to the University one of its most sacred trusts. To dissuade those who seek the higher education from entering this University is to expose them to the danger of non-Catholic institutions, and thus neutralize the effect of that Christian training which is provided at untold cost in the parochial school and Catholic college. To diminish in any way the influence of the University upon the life of this great American people would be to uphold and confirm those who cast upon the Church the reproach that she is no longer the teacher of mankind, and that she has never been the sincere friend of science and progress. If Catholics, in order to learn anything outside of theology, must sit at the feet of teachers who do not share our Catholic beliefs, then the intellectual power of Catholicism will be weakened, then, indeed, will we have forgotten the admonition of Leo XIII, "Catholics should be leaders not followers."

This country needs a university center of Catholic thought, where religion and science in their highest forms may combine to make known the marvellous truth of God; where scholarship aims to make known and defend religion, and give glory to our common manhood. Its mission should be to wield a vivifying influence on the whole educational system, to unify and elevate it, as also to give tone to all Catholic institutions; to set a definite standard of scholarship that will arouse in clergy and laity a love for the highest intellectual attainments; to advance the interests of science and widen out the horizon of human knowledge, by producing men prepared to do the work of science under the inspiration and guidance of revealed truth; to show the world that the Catholic Church is not afraid of the truth wherever found, but on the contrary is eager for the largest possible measure of truth. Thank God, this has been done by the Catholic University. The University is, and will be, in one sense, an object lesson, showing the attitude of the Catholic Church to the highest development of the mind.

It stands in the Capital City of our nation, close to the heart of our great Republic, in touch with the currents of national life, with its eyes upon all the movements that stir society, and it shapes and guides the education of men destined to be leaders in Church and State. Its voice is heard above the din and bustle of commercialism, warning men that society can find no solution for the problems that confront it, unless it be sought in the light of Him who came to teach and to save. It is the proud boast of the University that it has never for a moment wavered in its loyalty to the principles of

Christian philosophy, which alone can answer the demands of reason and give solid foundation to all religious and social life. Loyal in every fibre to the Holy See, true to the noblest ideals of Christian scholarship, and devoted to the best interests of our American life, the Catholic University is doing the work of God among our people. We have faith in it, as a mission from God, we are full of hope in its future, that with fidelity to the aims and purposes of the great Leo, as the very center of the highest scholarship it will always be the honor of our Church and the pride of our Republic.

There is a special delight for us in welcoming your Excellency, because as a religious and a superior of religious, you have had years of successful experience in our country. We are not a little proud that while clothed with the highest authority of the Holy See among us, and exercising the fullest spiritual jurisdiction, you are also a citizen of our Republic and enjoy all its political privileges. Then, again, as the son of the great St. Francis, your learning and piety and gentleness commend you to all who know you. In our neighboring Canada your mission as Apostolic Delegate has called forth the kindest sentiments of respect and affection for your personal character. You have that traditional love of learning which has been the inspiration of so many scholars of your order who are indetified with the universities of the world and rank as saints of God. You will find among our affiliated colleges, the college of your brethren, and among our students the members of your beloved order. I take it as a good omen that you are here on our Patronal Feast, sharing with us the glory and the graces of this day. We remember with gratification that the dogma of the Immaculate Conception found its foremost champions among the sons of St. Francis.

As Rector of the University, and in the name of its trustees, faculties, affiliated colleges, ecclesiastics, laymen, I welcome you among us as the Apostolic Delegate, the representative of Leo XIII, our illustrious Pontiff and beloved Father. We welcome you as the successor of delegates who by their learning, piety and kindly sympathy have won the deepest affection of our hearts. We offer to you this expression of our loyalty with an earnest prayer for your success in the important mission that has been entrusted to you by our Holy Father. We beg you to bear special watchfulness over all the interests of this University, and to be to it a father, a counsellor, and a friend. In return we pledge you our love and obedience.

After the applause which greeted the Rector's address the Most Rev. Delegate was enthusiastically received.

Reply of Mgr. Falconio.—*Right Rev. Rector:* Accept my sincerest thanks for the cordial welcome you have been pleased to tender to the representative of the Holy See in the name of the trustees, professors and students of the Catholic University of America.

Your sentiments of attachment and gratitude towards the Supreme Pontiff for all that he has done for the welfare of this institution are a source of great consolation to me, and afford me the hope that the Catholics of America will appreciate the deep interest which the Holy Father has taken in promoting more and more, through this University, the higher culture of the youth of this republic, and that they will profit by it.

Encouraged by the Supreme Pastor of the Church, and acting upon his wise counsels, the superiors will know how to govern with success, the professors how to teach with soundness of principles, and the students how to treasure up with confidence in their minds and in their hearts the precious teachings of science and religion, and to put them in practice.

Attached as you are to the Supreme Pontiff, the infallible teacher of truth, I have no doubt that, under his guidance, you will be able to work with success, and that the blessings I have mentioned will form the happy inheritance of this institution.

However, it is well to remember that, no matter how holy and how commendable may be the object we have in view, in order to come to its realization we shall have to overcome difficulties and work with courage, earnestness and perseverance. The end which the Holy Father had in view in the canonical erection of this University, as you have observed, is noble and useful. It is intended to give to the Catholic youth of America an opportunity to receive a scientific and religious education in its highest form—an education apt to render them not only possessors of the treasures of science and religion, but also to place them in a position to impart these blessings to others.

I know that, in order to realize fully this object, you will have to overcome difficulties and work with earnestness and perseverance. But as earnestness and perseverance are the factors of success, I have no doubt that, in the course of time, this young Catholic Institution will be second to none of the most illustrious universities of the land.

You have just recalled our attention to what the immortal Pontiff, Leo XIII has done for the welfare of the University. He is its founder, its protector, its guiding genius. Since its foundation he has never ceased to give it encouragement and to offer you the most evident proofs of his benevolence. You may be justly proud of such a patron. However, permit me to observe that this benevolence

of the Sovereign Pontiff will not surprise you when you consider the noble and effective part he has always taken in whatsoever concerns the scientific, moral and religious movements of modern society. During his long pontificate he has always wished that the Church should be more than ever at the head of every real progress in science, in art, in Christian knowledge. Nothing has escaped his vast and profound intelligence. Fine arts and letters, science of government and international relations, have found in him a profound and clear expositor, and a protector full of energy and good taste. But the most ardent desire of his heart has been not merely to illuminate the intelligence; he has also wished to move and purify the heart by applying himself earnestly to the revival of Christian virtues amongst the people. Hence it is that we see him so highly esteemed and honored by all men of good will who recognize in him a superior genius, the glory of the papacy and of the two centuries to which he belongs.

Then it is this ardent love for all that is grand, for all that is beautiful, for all that is good, and, at the same time, his esteem for this republic, which have led him to give to your University his patronage and to watch over it with constant solicitude. May God grant that, under such efficacious protection, you may arrive at that apex of glory which the name of Catholic University implies!

You, Rt. Rev. Rector, have made allusion to the young Franciscans who frequent the schools of the University. May these young men profit by them, and may the spirit of their glorious ancestors, who gave luster to some of the most renowned universities of Europe, be transmitted in them for the greater glory of God and of the Church.

Besides the Franciscans I observe that some other religious congregations profit by your teaching. Their buildings form, as it were, a crown surrounding the University. Thus science and religion, even in its most rigid form, seem to combine together to make of these young men a body of valiant soldiers to fight the battles of the Lord in both fields. May they emulate in virtue and in learning those bands of missionaries who from the earliest date of the discovery of America, at the cost of long and patient labor, laid the first germs of Christian civilization and high culture, which, in the course of time, fertilized by the zeal of their successors and of the secular clergy, have brought forth their fruit in that high civilization which places the American people on a level with the most advanced nations of the world!

This fraternal union of the secular and religious clergy of the United States in partaking of the benefits of an institution destined

for the highest intellectual development speaks well for the future of the University and of the Church in America.

Again I pray the Rt. Rev. Rector, the trustees, the faculties and the students to accept my best thanks for their sentiments of loyalty toward the Holy See, and best wishes for success.

In the afternoon was held a reception. The assembly room in McMahon Hall was crowded from four to six. A more brilliant gathering has never met within our walls. There were present members of the diplomatic corps, members of the administration, senators and representative of the United States, presidents and officials of many institutions of learning, and a large gathering of the more prominent residents of the city. The weather was faultless, and the entire proceedings of the day were calculated to leave an excellent impression on all who assisted at them. It is sincerely hoped that this event is a good omen for the career among us of the official representative of the Holy See.

THOMAS JOSEPH BOUQUILLON.

By the death of our Professor of Moral Sciences the University loses an original member of its staff of teachers, one who was identified with all its interests, a part of all its history, a principal factor in its growth, since the day when its doors were first opened to the studious Catholic youth of the United States.

Dr. Bouquillon was a typical Catholic theologian—for those who know what such words imply no more honorable praise is possible. To a minute acquaintance with the entire subject-matter of philosophy and theology, such as befits every well-bred priest, he added a knowledge of their literary history, such as is possessed by very few. Indeed, we may say at once that Catholicism is so much poorer by the loss of a genuine encyclopædic mind, one of that class of ecclesiastical savants who belong less to our own uncertain and disturbed days than to the calm academic world of cloister and library in the pre-revolutionary time. He grew up in an atmosphere of learning; books were his one concern in life, their content his study, their spirit his spirit, and their ideals his own. He had all the qualities of an eminent theologian—sincere and holy love of truth, thoroughness of investigation, order and method in his procedure, a dialectic at once sure and honest, an exposition clear and logical. If somewhat wanting in color and movement, he was never loose or confused. His memory was justly held to be prodigious; it threw its tentacles over all that came within his purview as one day possibly useful in any of his many lines of study. It was at once quick, tenacious, responsive. He was a walking “nomenclator” of all the modern theologians, beginning with the upcoming of the scholastics; more than once have his colleagues been amused and edified to see him complain, with chapter and verse, of the imperfections of great classical works of reference that seemed,

like seines, to have let nothing escape their exhaustive sweep. He was especially at home in all that pertained to the writings of Catholic theologians of the sixteenth and the seventeenth centuries, notably those of Spain and the Low Countries, whom he ever held in the highest esteem. His library held their best works and his students will remember with what delight he would wander from one old folio to another, building up slowly and persistently out of their treasures the doctrine he had to expound. Yet, he was not wont to swear "in verba magistri"; his mind was peculiarly self-contained and independent, one in which the judgment primed all the other faculties, leaving it apparently, at times, rather too cold and logical, the victim of its own insight and grasp.

As long as it endures, the University will owe his memory a debt of gratitude, for it was he who really laid its academic foundations. By age and service he was the principal among the little group of men called to begin in the United States the long slow work of the creation of a Catholic University amid circumstances that neither they, nor men wiser than they, quite thoroughly understood or mastered. He brought to the task, besides ardor and conviction, a wide knowledge of the pedagogical life of the older universities of Europe, their academic rights, privileges, spirit; also, their duties and responsibilities. He was deeply conscious of the dignity and the splendor of the academic office; whatever enhanced it or illustrated it was welcome to him; any blot or stain or degradation was to him as personal hurt or wrong. One might say that his commonwealth was the "*Universitas Studiorum*"; he wanted no better citizenship, no sweeter companionship, no honors or victories that it could not approve. Though our country and our language were new to him, his own democratic convictions and temper fitted him to coöperate in mapping out the general lines of development for the schools contemplated in the first stadium of the University's life. In this work he aided by counsel and study, by personal service at all times, by suggestions and corrections; in a word, he was never wanting in those earliest years, whatever were the task laid before him. In the University Senate he was always heard with profit. Somewhat

slow and hesitating in speech, he usually went at once to the core of the question or the kernel of the difficulty. His counsel was ever calm, dignified, conservative.

The Faculty of Theology always cherished him as its most learned member. Its curriculum of studies is particularly his work, and to the end he followed every new problem with an interest that never abated. In the Faculty meetings, in committee sessions, in familiar intercourse, the progress of ecclesiastical studies was his constant theme. His large conspectus over the theological arena of the past and present permitted him to speak with particular authority on most matters pertaining to the ecclesiastical sciences. Withal, he was modest and unassuming, and though he was at times tenacious in his views, he was always courteous and mild in his relations with his fellow professors.

Dr. Bouquillon possessed an innate gift for teaching. His real chair was not in the more or less formal work of the lecture-room, but in his "Seminar" or Academy. In this bi-weekly meeting of his students, and in the Journal Club or meeting for discussion of new books and review articles, each familiar and voluntary in its character, came out all the qualities of a mind peculiarly fitted to develop other minds—earnestness and devotion in research, patience and perseverance in the best methods, openness to all suggestions and indications, a large and correct view of the phases, relations, points of contact, shadings of the question at issue. Not a few young priests in all parts of our country owe to him the acquisition of a new sense—the historico-theological sense. The history of a question or problem was ever his first concern; what was its genesis, and how did other students handle it from the time it took shape and meaning? He was, therefore, easily eminent in bibliography, not only in that of his own beloved subject—the moral sciences—but in the particular bibliography of all the ecclesiastical sciences, as far as they bore on his own studies. It would not be too much to say that very few printed books of any importance to the theological sciences were unknown to him.

The Library of the Faculty of Theology was planned by him, set in order, and to his death administered with loving

fidelity and discriminating judgment. Its 30,000 volumes are no mean tribute to his taste and good sense, for it fits in admirably to the numerous other smaller libraries of the University, both public and private. To see it grow in riches and utility was his most sincere joy, for Dr. Bouquillon was a "bibliophile" of the first rank. His work-tables, ever covered with the newest and choicest literature of the moral and social sciences, drawn from every quarter, friendly and hostile, were themselves like bright hearth-stones, filling with a warm zeal the souls of his students and visitors.

Indeed, he was constantly besieged for help, not only by those of his own household, but by outsiders. In every rank of the clergy he had numerous correspondents; his *mémoires*, consultations, decisions, and other literary work, nameless now and intangible, are scattered far and wide between the oceans. The growing weakness of his health made him less communicative towards the end, but did not destroy the root of scholarly altruism that was a part of himself.

The Editors of *THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN* may not easily forget the wise and gentle scholar whose pen illustrates so many of its volumes, whose counsel was ever at the disposal of his colleagues, and whose pure academic spirit, it is hoped, will forever dwell with all the University publications.

Bouquillon was a very great theologian, by no means in the third rank, and the University has reason to congratulate itself, that his name is written first on the roll of its teachers. With his learning there came to us no little of the temper, the wisdom, the life-experience of the great Catholic theological schools of Europe. We shall always feel that through him there has been no break of continuity between Paris, Oxford, Louvain and Washington. As became a Roman student, he was devoted to the Roman Church. His writings give ample proof of this attachment which his teaching and habitual discourse emphasized.

He was an upright man, a pious priest, a faithful friend, a loyal churchman, patient and forgiving when assailed or misunderstood, a man of infinite sympathy with the world of his own time, truly a consulting physician of its social woes and moral ailments. Somewhat solitary and reserved in manner,

sedate and introspective, he lacked only a certain flow of imagination, a certain temperament of publicist, to make his name and his learning household words throughout the Catholic world. In return, he was a teacher of teachers, and his influence will forever be felt in the Church and in the land of his adoption. His numerous students will surely remember him at the holy altar; we may even hope that there will arise in their ranks some at least of our distinguished teachers of the future.

Exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor.

He was an apostle of the Higher Education of the Catholic Priesthood. It was in their service that he lived and toiled. And now that he is no more, may his example long shine before all who once sat at his feet, to bring forth similar fruits of virtue and learning! *Requiescat in pace!*

MEMORIAL EXERCISES FOR DR. BOUQUILLON.

The Memorial exercises for Very Rev. Thomas Bouquillon, D.D., late Professor of Moral Theology, were of a most impressive character. The presence of the Cardinal, the Archbishops and Bishops at the meetings at the University gave an opportunity for very marked tribute on their part to the memory of the professor and the universally recognized, much beloved and highly respected scholar. The occasion at the University was an academic one, the rector and professors appearing in their academic robes. The chapel was filled to its capacity with the visitors, the professors and students of the University, and the superiors and students of the affiliated colleges. Cardinal Gibbons occupied a place in the sanctuary, and beside him was the Rector of the University. Among those present were Most Rev. Archbishops Williams, of Boston; Ryan, of Philadelphia; Elder of Cincinnati; Ireland, of St. Paul; Christie, of Portland, Oregon; Keane, of Dubuque, and Farley, of New York; Right Rev. Bishops Maes, of Covington, Ky., and O'Gorman, of Sioux Falls, S. D., Professor Emeritus of Ecclesiastical History at the University; Monsignor Kennedy, Rector of the American College, Rome, Italy; Very Rev. Father Deshon, C.S.P., Provincial of the Paulists; Very Rev. Dr. Zahm, C.S.C., Provincial of the Holy Cross Congregation; Rev. Fr. Shandelle, S.J.; Rev. F. X. Mulvaney, S.J., Georgetown University; Rev. F. X. McCarthy, S.J., Gonzaga College; Brother Gordian, Visitor of the Baltimore Province of the Christian Brothers Colleges; Rev. Paul Griffith, Rev. Fr. Hurlbut, of Clarkesville, Md.; Rev. Fr. Tower, of Hyattsville, Md.; Dr. Mallon, the attending physician of Dr. Bouquillon.

Solemn Pontifical Mass of Requiem was celebrated by Right Rev. Bishop Maes, Rev. John Webster Melody, of Chicago, being the assistant priest; Rev. Joseph McSorley, C.S.P., deacon; Rev. Maurice J. O'Connor, of Boston, sub-deacon; Rev. Romanus Butin, S.M., and Rev. Thomas P. Heverin, of San Francisco, being masters of ceremonies. All the officers of the mass were among the older students of Dr. Bouquillon's classes.

At the conclusion of the Mass Rev. William J. Kerby, Ph.D., Associate Professor of Sociology, a former pupil of Dr. Bouquillon, delivered the eulogy.

DISCOURSE OF REV. DR. KERBY.

Thomas Bouquillon, Priest, Doctor of Theology, Professor of Moral Theology in the University since 1889, is dead. We are summoned by the University to attend this solemn ceremony in memory of him, and to offer public prayer for the happy repose of his soul. Denied the melancholy comfort of seeing and serving him in his last moments, we can in our quiet grieving only picture the freshly made grave in distant Belgium while we here ask God to give him rest.

One would rather weep alone, and think in silence over the life and character of this calm kindly man, but the University, obeying the impulse that springs from gratitude and love, must pay public tribute to him who was its pride and glory. Great as is the loss which his death inflicts, it were far greater did his name and memory perish from our traditions. May this solemn service fix both name and memory in these traditions forever!

Thomas Bouquillon was born at Warneton in Belgium, May 16, 1842. He studied philosophy and theology at Roulers and Bruges. He was ordained in Rome in 1865. He entered the Gregorian University and was made Doctor of Theology in 1867. In the same year he was appointed Professor of Moral Theology in the Seminary of Bruges. In 1877 he was appointed to the Catholic University of Lille, France; in 1889, he came to this University as Professor of Moral Theology, and taught here till the close of the past year. His health began to fail some time ago. He went to Europe in June of the present year; failing rapidly, he was unable to return, and he died last Thursday.

He published the following works: "*Theologia Moralis Fundamental*," the third edition of which is now issuing from the press; "*De Virtutibus Theologicis*," in one volume and "*De Virtute Religionis*," in two volumes. He had completed, but not published, three volumes "*De Justitia et Jure*"; "*De Eucharistia*"; "*De Pœnitentia*." He edited and enriched with critical and historical notes the following: "*De Magnitudine Ecclesiæ Romanæ*," of Thomas Stapleton; "*Leonis XIII. Allocutiones, Epistolæ, Aliaque Acta*," the *Catechismus ad Parochos*, the *Dies Sacerdotalis* of Dirckink"; "*l'Excellence de la Sainte Eucharistie* of Luis de Grenada." He published upwards of fifty articles, pamphlets, critical, theological, historical.

The simple mention of these facts conveys no just impression of the merit, activity and power of our departed colleague. His was a life so filled with usefulness that one can with difficulty estimate it, and that difficulty is increased when affection and gratitude bid one be loving rather than analytical or exact.

Strange it is and wonderful that life should be such a mystery, baffling, fascinating, evasive; attracting us to study it, and disappointing us by the failure which we meet; understood, yet never thoroughly so; varied and inconstant as the play of sunbeams on the floating clouds, yet stable and identical as the very mountain. Philosophy has not defined it, nor thinking explained it, nor investigation revealed its secrets. And hence when one is taken from us—one who stood alone in attainments of mind and heart—strange insistent questions arise within us and demand reply. "What is life, what its meaning, what is noblest, highest; what deep truths should we learn from it and how shall we read them?" We seek for answer, but tears blind, they do not sharpen vision. We would remain silent in contemplation of our loss—as we might were we to see a stately ship laden with rarest treasure from many lands engulfed and lost forever. Like a stately ship, this mind that death has taken was richly stored with treasures of knowledge, understanding, and wisdom from many lands. It is lost to us now, except in memory. Well may we to-day study that life—so simple, so humble, so strong, so useful, true, and seek to learn the lessons of virtue in which it so abounded.

Thomas Bouquillon was in manner simple, gentle, courteous, sympathetic, kind, marked by sincerity and directness. In disposition unselfish and helpful, he was far more pleased in serving others than in being served. Optimistic, invariably cheerful, hopeful, his influence was always constructive, and his example an inspiration. Gifted with rare mental power, he lacked aggressiveness and ostentation, delighting rather in the retirement and silence of his beloved library. In conversation and in counsel last to speak and wisest when speaking, his self-repression was no less rare than it was admirable. No one ever heard him boast of what he had done or could do; his personality seemed lost in his learning. Well may we say of him as he said of his Master Aquinas: "*Nihil habuit de se ipso.*" He lived on his admirations and not on his dislikes; he was charitable, tolerant of view and of personality, never volunteering an unfriendly remark or an unnecessary criticism. Again, as he said of St. Thomas we may say of him: "*Nihil habuit contra alios.*" Reverent, affectionate, deeply religious, one would think that he was writing himself into his book when he enumerated in his "Fundamental Theology" the qualities of the theologian, *fides viva, magna reverentia, perfecta sinceritas, ardens veritatis amor, libertas a præju-*

dicis gentis, instituti, scholæ, ordinis. The sweet serenity of his scholarly, priestly life, which rested on sure foundations, was never disturbed by the misrepresentations of trifling critics who served party and not truth, nor by the forgetfulness of those whom he had served, nor by the misunderstanding of those who had neither mind nor will to know the magnitude of his scholarship, the unselfishness of his work, and the simple, honest motives that dominated his life.

Nothing tempted him away from the pursuit of learning. Wise enough to know the values and relations of life according to which books are kept for eternity, he lived always in close touch with great men in church and state without seeking, loving or using the power that position brings.

In making for the moment a first estimate of Thomas Bouquillon, one feels that one may apply to him without irreverence St. Paul's description of charity. For like it, he was patient, kind; he envied not nor dealt perversely, was not puffed up; was not ambitious; sought not his own; was not provoked to anger; thought no evil. Rejoiced not in iniquity, but rejoiced with the truth; bore all things, believed all things, endured all things.

Of his learning, only one equally gifted could adequately speak. Blessed with a mind of rare and varied power, he brought to it a diligence, a consecutive methodical habit of study, that made him little less than a prodigy. He had a vast knowledge of facts, saw principles clearly, coördinated them accurately and based his interpretations on solid foundations. Careful in his mental processes, his convictions, opinions, views were as free from the influence of feeling, interest and preference as it is possible to imagine. His great knowledge was always at his service, within the call of consciousness. His views were therefore thorough, broad and safe. When analyzed, they were found to have been so carefully made that one thought of the many colors that the prism reveals in the ray of sunlight. History, philosophy, psychology, theology, science—all had converged into the beam of light that came from his splendid mind. He was Emerson's "All-reconciling thinker." We may aptly apply to our departed colleague the keen words of Silvius, who said of St. Thomas: "*Quattuor implacabiliter inter se pugnancia, brevitās cum multitudine, multitudo cum securitate, securitas cum facilitate, facilitas cum brevitate, indissolubili pacis fœdere copulata, hic inveniuntur.*"

Thus objective and critical, thus synthetic, erudite and honest, thus diligent, he could not have been other than an extraordinary man.

His knowledge of the literary sources of his beloved science—moral theology—was coextensive with the sources themselves. His grasp of its principles was profound, his exposition luminous, erudite, balanced. He lifted the science high over the plane of casuistry,

placed it on the higher levels of principle and philosophy, giving to it dignity and system. Again, as he said of St. Thomas: "*Apud ipsum moralis theologia toto suo nitore resplendens sua gravitate nobilis, objecti amplitudine immensa, apparet prout vere est, omnium scientiarum practicarum domina ac regina.*"

Remarkable for the accuracy of his theological sense, his mind was none the less historical. His keen understanding of movements of thought and life as well as his wide knowledge about them, revealed the true historical sense—the power to see and measure the converging complex processes which produce institutions; to discover beginnings, trace relations, see developments, and analyze the intangible yet powerful influences that combine to make movements in human society. This power alone might have made him a marked man. Reading history as a master theologian, and reading theology as a critical historian, his appreciation of the supernatural, as an historical fact as well as a theoretical truth, was remarkably accurate and profound. This was possibly the highest achievement of his mind. He possessed a knowledge of the sciences closely related to his own which was almost extensive enough to give his opinion authority, while his acquaintance with more remote fields was exceptionally wide.

He was thoroughly devoted to his students, exact in doing his duty, generous of time and energy beyond that and tireless in stimulating thought; patient and always hopeful of success. From his lectures and his students, from the revision of his books, he turned frequently, and always gladly, to assist, direct or advise a younger colleague in the university, from him to some scholar or student from other quarters who, perhaps, not sharing his faith, admired his learning and sought his aid; from such he turned to problems, questions, requests for information, assistance, sent to him by men high and low in church and state. With all he was gracious, ready, generous; so that we must again say of him as he said of St. Thomas: "*Adfuit principibus in consilium, pontificibus in adjutorium, fratribus in defensionem.*"

Learned in the history of universities, he was consecrated to the welfare of our own. Never shirking the dull routine of committee, though his heart would have kept him among his books, he was not one to minimize the duties of any office that came to him, no matter how it distracted him from intellectual work. He was consequently a great constructive force in our academic life by his activity, as he was an inspiration by his attainments—a splendid realization of our high ideal.

In all of these varied and exacting demands no one ever found him nervous, heard him complain of overwork, or knew him to be other than genial, helpful, scholarly, retiring and kind.

This hurried enumeration of some of the traits of mind, heart and manner of Thomas Bouquillon is complete enough to allow us to draw many useful lessons from his life. He taught us that highest scholarship is consistent with reverent, abiding religious faith; that power may be quiet and unobtrusive without failing of its possibilities; that simplicity, gentleness and charity—calm, enduring charity—are worthy adornments of any scholar; that a life free from all vile ambition for temporal glory and from self-seeking may contain within itself sources of endless peace, serenity and joy; that true learning spiritualizes, ennobles, sanctifies life. How well his life illustrates the words of St. James: *"Who is a wise man and endued with knowledge among you, let him show by a good conversation his work in the meekness of wisdom. . . . But the wisdom that is from above, first indeed is chaste, then peaceable, modest, easy to be persuaded, consenting to the good, full of mercy and good fruits, without judging, without dissimulation."*

Any life that taught this much were a rare benediction indeed, but we have not yet discovered the secret of this life, no more than would the enumeration of the parts of a delicate and complex piece of mechanism tell us what was its function. The life, the work, of Thomas Bouquillon was one great solemn act of consecration to the Church of Christ as an historical institution. Understand that and you understand him; miss that and you miss the law, the glory and the inspiration of his life and mind. I speak not of his personal faith as a Catholic priest, nor of the tender piety that inspired his beautiful commentary on the mysteries of the Rosary, or brought him every day to visit Christ in the Blessed Sacrament on his way to the lecture room. These were, perhaps, not altogether distinctive. I refer to his unwavering, generous loyalty to the Church as an organization: to the remarkable degree in which he understood the genius of her institutions, absorbed her spirit, shared her point of view, believed, approved, defended, expressed it, honestly, bravely and well.

Our minds sometimes play subtle tricks on us. While we revere the authority, doctrine and definitions of the Church in the abstract, we may fail to do so equally in the concrete; while Church authority as a proposition receives complete submission, Church authority as a fact, perhaps, may not; while in theory we are Catholic in a general sense, in fact we at times become partisan. Witness the history of disorders in the Church or the recent history of France and Germany. Unlike all such and safe from any similar mistake was Thomas Bouquillon. His loyalty, devotion, love; his thought, his energy, were consecrated to the concrete Church: to the persons in whom the providence of God has vested authority; to the Church entire; to no party, view or school other than that of the Church itself.

The great, luminous, central fact of history was to him the Incarnation: the great permanent and pervading fact of history since the Incarnation was the Church; the great fundamental science, which set standards, corrected criteria and systematized knowledge, was theology, "*Domina ac regina scientiarum.*" Dogmatic theology, moral theology, canon law, Church history, were in a particular sense in his mind one. His objective views permitted nothing more than a distinction between abstract and concrete. He had read the Fathers with sympathy that gave him understanding; he had read theologians and philosophers with acumen; he knew modern thought accurately. Ever objective, truth seeking, truth loving, ancient things were to him not true because old, nor were modern things false because new. Throughout all the variations of thought, of life and institution which mark the centuries he saw his Church—permanent, enduring, divine. His mind understood well the supernatural; the Church was its organized expression. And all of the reverence, love, devotion, power of his being were consecrated to God in the service of his Church. The Church was his *pia mater*. Its limitations he saw much as a devoted child sees a fault in a parent—reluctantly, though honestly. His devotion to the university rested on the view that it was an organ of the Church, that in it and through it might be worked out safely processes of thought that would help to place theology and philosophy in safe and harmonious adjustment with what was right, true and enduring in modern thought and institutions. Hence also his love of learning, his industry, his qualities of mind and heart. Gather them all together, arrange them around this central complete consecration to the historical Church, and the life of Thomas Bouquillon is understood. For this all, from this all, to this all. Therefore, it is not unbecoming that his name be mentioned from this altar or that his personality and his learning be praised to-day.

It is unnecessary to attempt to study the influences which produced him. How far nature, how far grace, how far the sturdy Catholic traditions of his native Belgium, strengthened by his life in Rome, how far his absorbing devotion to St. Thomas, contributed—it were too difficult to say. Nor need we say. His character, his achievements are before us; our duty is to remember, to revere, to imitate.

Then rest, gentle, kindly spirit, rest in the bosom of God! May the earth press lightly on thy mortal remains; may thy grave be honored! Be thy memory a benediction forever!

And thou, O University, center of our hopes, forget not him who was thy pride and glory! He watched and loved and served thee in thy first days—do thou love and bless him even unto thy last!

VERY REV. DR. MAGNIEN.

The death of Doctor Magnien on December 21, 1902, is a matter of sincere regret not only to his immediate colleagues in St. Mary's Seminary, but also to the Church in the United States. As head of an institution which has trained so many of the American clergy, he displayed those qualities of mind and heart which enlist the sympathy of the student and secure the esteem of the priest. Practical insight into the needs of the Church, breadth of view, tact in dealing with characters and situations, prudence in counsel and unfailing kindness, were his distinguishing traits. To these in large measure is due his success in the administration of the Seminary which holds so prominent a place in the work of clerical training.

In all the larger problems of education he was deeply interested. From its inception, the work of the University appealed to him strongly; and he was ever ready to further it by suggestions and advice based on his long experience. For its professors he had always that cordial welcome which is prompted by community of high purpose and by the genuine spirit of coöperation. Beyond the difficulties of the beginning, he saw the ideal and strove as best he could for its realization.

The director of a theological Seminary is called to bear responsibilities and to discharge duties which are of vital importance to religion, but which are not generally understood by the world at large. It is all the more needful that he should be both a man of character and a model to those who are preparing for the priesthood. St. Sulpice has produced many directors of this type. Doctor Magnien's life was a true expression of the Sulpitian spirit. He was an exemplary priest.

NOTES AND COMMENT.

The Encyclicals of Leo XIII.—(Leon XIII d'après ses Encycliques, Jean d'Arras. Paris: Poussielgue, 1902. 8°, pp. 273.) The author classifies the teachings of the Pope under the following headings: The Church and Truth, Religious Unity, The Church and the Civil Power, The Training of the Priesthood, Freemasonry, The Organization of the Family, Social and Economic Questions, Political Duties of Catholics, Christian Piety and Devotion. When one has read it through it is clear with what success the Holy Father has made known the teachings of Catholicism on all these points.

The Holy Shroud of Turin.—The newest phase of the question of the authenticity of the Holy Shroud (il Santo Sudario) of Turin has given rise to more than 3,000 brochures, reviews and newspaper articles. In "Le Saint Suaire de Turin": Histoire d'une Rélique (Paris, Picard, 1902, 8vo, pp. 19) are resumed the historical proofs of its non-authenticity due to the pen of Canon Ulysse Chevalier. They have been fortunate enough to receive the adhesion of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles-Lettres, of M. Léopold Delisle, and of the Bollandists—certainly an uncommon assurance of correctness. In "Le Saint Suaire de Turin photographié à l'envers" (Paris, Picard, 1902, 8vo, pp. 13) M. Hippolyte Chopin maintains that the famous photographs of MM. Secondo Pia and P. Sanna Solaro are made not from the right or front side of the "Sudario" but from the reverse, the original painting having been covered and repaired in 1534 with very fine "toile de Hollande" by the Clarisses of Chambéry. "J'ai donc droit," says M. Chopin (p. 13) "de déclarer aujourd'hui que toute discussion basée sur la photographie de M. Pia ne peut être que stérile, parceque le docuement est faussé, et qu'il ne peut servir qu'à faire repandre bien inutilement des torrents d'encre et des avalanches d'articles, tant qu'on n'aura pas examine l'original du *bon côté*."

Critical Bibliography.—MM. Alphonse Picard et fils (82, Rue Bonaparte, Paris) have inaugurated a "Bibliothèque de Bibliographies Critiques" to be edited by the "Société des Etudes Historiques" of which the bibliographer M. Henri Stein is president, and M. Funck-Brentano vice-president. These bibliographies aim at being exhaustive in the departments of general, provincial, and municipal history; the history of institutions, manners, customs, arts;

the history of literature; in biography, geography and the economic and social sciences. Some seventeen have already appeared and over a hundred more are announced. We have before us those on "Latin Epigraphy," by M. Cagnat; "Hoffman," by Henri de Curzon; "Les Conflits entre la France et l'Empire pendant le Moyen Age," by A. Leroux, and "Taine," by Victor Giraud. Very brief notes often accompany the book or article cited. The story of the long conflict between the Holy Roman Empire and the Crown of France is here outlined in the titles of 363 books and articles; the life and writings of Taine in 292. In the latter (p. 75, no. 262) Lorensbury should read "Lounsbury." These bibliographies are excellent, cheap, and highly serviceable, not only each one in itself, but as a collection. In the latter form they will render mutual service of cross-reference and completeness. Every working-library and "academy" of history should subscribe to the series.

The First Universities.—The origins of the universities of Paris and Bologna (Polleunis and Ceuterick, Louvain, 1902, 8vo, pp. 23) furnish the text of a pleasing and instructive discourse delivered by Dr. Cauchie, Professor of Church History in the University of Louvain, at the annual reunion of the alumni of the Séminaire de Bonne Espérance (September 19, 1901). The documents of Denifle-Chate-lain, and the synthetic work of Rashdall, furnish the basis and outlines of the description. But it is carried out with all the additional learning and the gifts of style and exposition that the historical world to-day recognizes in the able successor of Dr. Jungmann. Dr. Cauchie is one of those who have infused new life into the venerable schools of Louvain.

Edward Bruce and Ireland.—The original sources of Irish history for the early part of the fourteenth century have been carefully examined by Miss Caroline Colvin for her doctorate thesis in history before the University of Pennsylvania. The study is entitled "The Invasion of Ireland by Edward Bruce, 1315-1318" (Philadelphia, 1901) and is made at first hand from the contemporary annals, chronicles, histories, as well as from the modern collections of documentary material of the period. It is high time that the neglected history of Ireland be treated after the scientific and objective manner of this treatise. But this will not be until academic historical formation is more common among its students and narrators. And that will not happen until a truly national government sits at Dublin, and inaugurates for this ancient folk what Stein did for Prussia, a "*Monumenta Hiberniæ Historica*" with all that such an enterprise means.

The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803.—The Arthur H. Clark Company, Cleveland, O., announce in a limited edition, an extensive, and unusually important literary undertaking—an historical series entitled “The Philippine Islands, 1493-1803: Explorations by early Navigators, descriptions of the Islands and their Peoples, their History, and records of the Catholic Missions, as related in contemporaneous books and manuscripts, showing the political, economic, commercial, and religious conditions of those Islands from their earliest relations with European Nations to the beginning of the nineteenth century,” in fifty-five volumes, the first of which will appear about January 15, 1903. This work will present (mainly in English translation) the most important printed works, to the year 1803, including a great number of heretofore unpublished MSS., which have been gathered from various foreign archives and libraries, principally from Spain, Portugal, France, England, Italy, Mexico, Japan, the Philippines, etc. The manuscripts which have been known to a very few scholars only, and have been very difficult heretofore to study, are of great importance at the present time.

The series will be edited and annotated by Miss Emma Helen Blair, A.M., of the State Historical Society of Wisconsin, assistant editor of “The Jesuit Relations and Allied Documents,” and James Alexander Robertson, Ph.B., also formerly engaged upon that work. An historical introduction and notes are furnished by Edward Gaylord Bourne, Professor of History in Yale University, well known as an authority on early Spanish discoveries and colonization in the New World. The series will include a very careful and extensive bibliography of Philippina—the most valuable that has yet appeared. There will also be an exhaustive, analytical index to the complete series.

The selection of documents to be published in this series has been made with special reference to the social and economic conditions of the Islands under the Spanish régime, and to the history of the missions conducted therein by great religious orders of the Roman Catholic Church. The undertaking is commended by well-known scholars, librarians, and ecclesiastics, and promises to be one of the most important literary events of this decade. The work will contain many illustrations of historical importance from Spanish and other originals, from manuscripts, etc. It will further be illustrated with modern and old maps, plans of cities, views, convents, architecture, etc. It will give for the first time in the English language, the complete, original sources of our knowledge of these islands for over three centuries, and will thereby make accessible to

scholars for the first time the books and manuscripts to which we must refer to get a clear and correct view of the social, economical, political, and religious state and history of the islands. Many important and almost unknown manuscripts now published for the first time will throw much new light on present conditions and on the inner history. The sources and authorities in every case will be carefully given, and the locations of rare Philippina in libraries at home and abroad will always be stated. The text will be carefully elucidated by notes, geographic, historical, ethnological, etc., and many contributions by well-known scholars and specialists will be included.

This work is of great value and interest at the present time, when a correct knowledge of the islands is absolutely necessary, and it will contain much of interest to students of geography, ethnology, linguistics, folklore, comparative religion, ecclesiastical history, administration, etc. The economic and commercial aspects will be given due attention, and it is the intention of the editors to make the work such that it will be highly welcome to librarians who are already seriously embarrassed in trying to meet the demand, in both reference and public libraries, for information relative to our Malaysian possessions—a demand which is increasing rapidly and must continue to increase.

Louis XVIII and the Hundred Days.—The latest volumes of the valuable publications of the “*Société d'Histoire Contemporaine*” bring us the correspondence between the envoys of London and Berlin and their respective governments during the ephemeral restoration of Napoleon that ended so disastrously at Waterloo. Sir Charles Stuart's letters to Lord Castlereagh and Count von der Goltz's letters to the Prussian minister Hardenburg illustrate the hopes and anxieties of Louis XVIII during his temporary exile at Gand. They also illustrate the rigid determination of England and Prussia not to tolerate the reestablishment of a Bonaparte régime. The business-like correspondence of Stuart interests less than the more chatty newsy letters of the Prussian nobleman. (“*Louis XVIII et les Cent Jours à Gand, Recueil de documents inédits*,” par Albert Malet, Paris, Picard, 1902, 8vo, 2 vols.)

Historic Highways of America.—Under the above title Arthur Butler Hulbert begins a series of fifteen volumes destined to deal with the great pathways that nature, the wild beast, the Indian, and civilized man, have made across the face of the New World. The first volume treats of the roads made by the mound-building Indians,

and of the pathways of the buffalo in its annual migrations. Other volumes will deal with Indian thoroughfares, the roads of the pioneers, historic and military roads, the great canals, and the roads of the future. Every volume will be a welcome illustration of the great historic truth that the roads of a land are the real arteries and veins of its social and political life. (Arthur H. Clark Co., Cleveland, 1902, 8vo, pp. 140.)

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

Meeting of the Board of Directors.—The annual meeting of the trustees of the Catholic University was held Wednesday, Nov. 12. Those present were His High Eminence James, Cardinal Gibbons, Most Rev. John J. Williams, D.D., Archbishop of Boston; Most Rev. Patrick J. Ryan, D.D., Archbishop of Philadelphia; Most Rev. John Ireland, DD., Archbishop of St. Paul; Most Rev. John J. Keane, D.D., Archbishop of Dubuque; Most Rev. John M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York; Right Rev. John L. Spalding, D.D., Archbishop of Peoria; Right Rev. Camillus P. Maes, D.D., Bishop of Covington, Ky., and secretary of the board; Right Rev. John S. Foley, D.D., Bishop of Detroit; Right Rev. Ignatius F. Horstmann, D.D., Bishop of Cleveland, and Right Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D.D., Rector of the University.

Cardinal Gibbons presided. The forenoon was given to the consideration of the reports of the different committees. The Committee on Finance, of which Archbishop Williams is chairman, found the report of the Rector and Treasurer clear, full and satisfactory, and accepted the report of the auditors who had examined the assets and investments of the University. It was found that the finances are in a most satisfactory condition. During the year the receipts amounted to \$158,917.29 and the disbursements to \$155,268.73, leaving a balance of \$3,648.56. Of the amount received \$66,517.25 came from the earnings of the trust funds and other ordinary sources of revenue. There have been received in bequests during the year \$26,370.95; from sales of property, \$33,222.19; by endowments this year, \$19,465.41, and from the Bishops' Guarantee Fund, \$10,400. Eleven thousand seven hundred dollars were paid this year on the general indebtedness of the University. The gross indebtedness of the University is \$193,500; the assets on hand amount to \$59,493.10, making the net indebtedness \$134,006.90, or \$11,700 less than last year.

The Committee on Studies and Discipline, through its chairman, Bishop Horstmann, reported in commendation of the program of studies as proposed by the University, as also the reports as to discipline in Caldwell Hall and Keane Hall.

The Committee on Organization, Archbishop Ryan chairman, reported by the Rector, was approved. The appointment to the chair departments of the University. The coördination of faculties, reported by the Rector, was approved. The appointment to the chair

formerly held by the late Very Rev. Dr. Bouquillon was deferred to the April meeting. The meeting amended the by-laws of the board by voting to change the time of meeting from November to the second Wednesday after Easter.

Bishop Matthew Harkins, of Providence, R. I., was elected trustee, to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Archbishop Corrigan.

The board elected the following officers: His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, president; Most Rev. Archbishop Williams, vice-president; Right Rev. Bishop Maes, secretary, and Mr. Thomas E. Waggaman, of Washington, D. C., treasurer. The Rector, Bishop Conaty, was appointed acting assistant treasurer.

There was no appointment to the vice-rectorship, the place being left open for the present. The board appointed a Committee on Investments, consisting of Cardinal Gibbons, Bishop Conaty and Mr. Michael Jenkins, of Baltimore. Dr. Joseph H. McMahon, of New York, who is assisting the Rector in the completion of the Endowment Fund, made a report which was very satisfactory. The board voted to lease a site on the University grounds for the erection of a new apostolic mission house. Several matters of importance were referred to the April meeting.

Patronal Feast of the University.—The Patronal Feast of the University was celebrated, as usual, on December 8. Solemn Pontifical Mass was sung by the Rector, Right Rev. Bishop Conaty. The celebrant was assisted by Rev. Wm. B. Martin, of New York; deacon, Rev. Stephen N. Moore, of Peoria; sub-deacon, Rev. Fr. Achstetter, of Baltimore, and master of ceremonies, Rev. Thomas E. McGuigan, of Baltimore. His Excellency, Most Rev. Archbishop Falconio, the new Apostolic Delegate to the United States, was present in the sanctuary in cope and mitre, assisted by Very Rev. John A. Burns, C.S.C., president of Holy Cross College, and Very Rev. Daniel Duffy, S.S., president of St. Austin's College. As this was an academic occasion the professors and students of the University wore their academic robes. Very Rev. Mgr. Rooker occupied a seat in the sanctuary. After the First Gospel Rev. D. J. Stafford, S.T.D., delivered an eloquent sermon. At the end of the Mass the Most Rev. Delegate gave the Papal Blessing.

The New Marist College.—On November 1, Feast of All Saints, the Rt. Rev. Rector blessed the corner-stone of the new college building in which the Marist Fathers will conduct their Apostolic School or Juniorate. It is located at Second and Savannah Streets, N. E., within easy reach of the University grounds. The plans,

which have been drawn by Mr. A. O. Von Herbulis, provide for a structure three stories high with a frontage of 131 feet and a depth of 77 feet. The style is English Gothic and the material is brick with trimmings in Indiana stone. The building will accommodate ten professors and sixty students.

Gifts to the Library.—Among other valuable gifts the University Library has received a copy of "*Isocratis Orationes Tres*," printed at Venice "apud hæredes Petri Ravani et socios, MDLV." Though not a treasure of the earliest "cradle-period" of printing, it is still a very old and rare book. Only the Greek text is paginated. A very literal Latin translation creates the impression that the booklet was printed "*ad usum discentium*." The University is indebted for this valuable text to the generosity of Mr. Matthew Daly, Esq., of Brooklyn, N. Y.

The New Apostolic Mission House.—On the afternoon of Thursday, November 13, in the presence of a large number of visitors, professor and students of the University and surrounding colleges, His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons broke ground on the site of the New Apostolic Mission House on the grounds of the University, leased by the Missionary Union at the recent meeting of the Board of Trustees. This ceremony marks an event of national importance, and is destined to be far-reaching in its influence upon the work of the Catholic Church in this country. The ceremony occurs on the thirteenth anniversary of the opening of the University, and seems to be second only in importance to the establishment of that institution.

Among those present were: His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Most Rev. Archbishops John J. Williams, William Henry Elder, Patrick J. Ryan, John Ireland, Alexander Christie, John J. Keane, John M. Farley, Right Rev. Bishops Camillus P. Maes, Thomas O'Gorman, Thomas J. Conaty, Monsignor Kennedy, rector of the American College, Rome, Italy; Very Rev. J. A. Zahm, C.S.C., provincial of the Holy Cross congregation; Very Rev. Fr. Deshon, C.S.P., provincial of the Paulists; Rev. Walter Elliott, C.S.P., superior of the Apostolic Mission House; Rev. A. P. Doyle, C.S.P., New York.

Conference of the Association of American Universities.—The third annual conference of the Association was held at Columbia University, New York City, December 29, 30 and 31, 1902. Several important papers were presented and discussed, and matters of business transacted. Dr. G. R. Parkins, President of Lower Canada College and Secretary of the Board of Trustees of the Cecil Rhodes

Scholarship Fund, appeared before the association, and gave an interesting account of the establishment of the fund and the work that is being done preliminary to the assignment of the scholarships, and expressed the desire for any advice that members of the association might be able to give. The Catholic University of America was represented by Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, S.T.D., Rector, and Daniel W. Shea, Ph.D., General Secretary. An invitation from Bishop Conaty to hold the next conference in Washington was taken under advisement by the executive committee. The Catholic University of America was made a member of the executive committee. On the evening of December 30, the association was given a banquet at Sherry's by the New York Alumni of the universities composing the association. Rev. P. H. Hayes, S.T.L., Secretary to Archbishop Farley, and President of the Catholic University of America Alumni Association, was a member of the reception committee. The University Club and the Century Club of New York very courteously extended the members of the Association of Universities the privileges of their clubs. Columbia University maintained fully its tradition for splendid hospitality.

Faculty of Law.

General University Lectures.—Of the five courses of general university lectures offered by the Faculty of Law, two have been commenced during the current term—the course on the principles and processes of oratory, and the course on religious corporations. The course on oratory has been given on Monday in the law lecture room in McMahon Hall, and has been attended by between forty and fifty students, drawn from all departments of the University and from the colleges of the religious orders. This course of lectures is auxiliary to the courses on homiletics and sacred eloquence offered in the faculty of theology, and to the course in forensics offered in the School of Law. The subjects treated in this course are: I, The Psychological Process involved in Oratory; II, The Training of the Orator; III, The Contents of an Oration; IV, The Preparation of an Oration; V, The Delivery of an Oration. The course on Religious Corporations has been delivered on Wednesdays in one of the lecture rooms in Caldwell Hall, and has been attended by thirty or more students, most of them belonging to the School of Theology. The subjects treated in this course are: I, The general law of the land concerning corporations and associations, especially those organized for the promotion of charitable and religious enterprises; II, The legal status of Catholic ecclesiastical corporations and associations in the United States, in-

cluding the relations of Church and State in each state in the Union, and the laws of each state in reference to religious bodies; III, The incidental legal rights and duties of Catholic ecclesiastical corporations and associations in the United States, with special reference to limitations upon property rights, exemptions from taxation and other public burdens, the validity of charitable devises and bequests to pious uses, etc. The first subject is now under discussion with the class by Dr. W. C. Robinson. The second will be taken up early in the winter term by Rev. Dr. Creagh. The third will follow under Dr. Robinson. The object of this course is to afford to the clergy educated at the University an opportunity to become sufficiently acquainted with the legal rights and obligations of parishes, asylums, etc.; to enable them to protect the interests committed to their charge, and to become safe advisers in matters pertaining to the business management of church affairs.

The Decision in the Riverside Law Suit.—Although the Faculty of Law has no greater interest in the property of the University than any other of its academic departments, the decision of the Riverside suit in favor of the University affords them a peculiar satisfaction, as confirming their unanimous opinion concerning the rights of the University in reference to this controversy. The matter is important enough to all friends of the University to receive a brief mention in these pages. In 1897 the University sold a tract of land on Riverside Drive in the City of New York, a portion of the McMahon estate, for \$100,000, giving to the purchaser an executory contract to be followed by a deed when certain payments had been made. The purchaser, having paid a small amount, erected a building on the land at an expense of upwards of \$10,000, and soon after abandoned the land, leaving the building unpaid for, and making no further payments on the purchase money. The University was compelled to take back the land and again put it on the market for sale. The contractors with the purchaser, who had erected the building, then made claims upon the University for the payment of their bills, and having placed mechanics' liens upon the land, proceeded to foreclose them in the courts of New York. Upon the trial of the case in the lower court the University was defeated, and judgment rendered against it for \$10,419.88. From this judgment the University appealed to the Appellate Division of the First Department, where the judgment below was affirmed by a divided court. From this decision another appeal was taken to the Court of Appeals, which reversed the decisions of the lower courts and by a unanimous judgment of the six judges

present at the hearing determined the suit in favor of the University. In rendering their decision the court said:

"The judgment appealed from should be reversed. The mechanics' liens involved in this action were filed against property now owned by the Catholic University of America. The appellant insists that the labor and materials furnished, for which liens were filed, were not furnished either with its consent or, at its request, although its property has been held liable therefor. It is not even pretended that the university requested the performance of the labor or the furnishing of the material employed in the erection of the building upon the appellant's land. Nor do we think there was any such consent as is contemplated by the statute relating to the subject. . . . The only ground upon which the Appellate Division held that the university consented to the erection of buildings on its land is that the contract of sale effected such consent. The provision upon which that court relied as constituting consent was as follows: 'It is further understood and agreed that the vendee shall have the right of immediate possession to the property hereinbefore mentioned and described for the purpose of erecting buildings thereon.' Obviously, the only effect of that provision was to give the vendee the right of possession which he would not otherwise have had, and it cannot be regarded as a consent under the provisions of the Lien Law to the erection of the building constructed by Dexter. It is to be observed that, while there was consent by the vendor that the vendee should have the right of possession for the purpose of erecting buildings thereon, there was no consent whatever to the construction of the particular building erected. It is quite evident that the university had knowledge of the fact that the defendant Dexter intended to improve the property by the erection of a building thereon. There was, however, no proof of any knowledge upon its part as to the character of the building to be erected, of the erection of the building constructed, or that the university acquiesced therein. Proof of the existence of that knowledge was insufficient to establish a consent, under the Lien Law, to the erection of any building which the vendee should conclude to or did erect. The decision of the learned Appellate Division in that respect is in direct conflict with the later decisions of this court (*Vosseller v. Slater*, 25 App. Div., 368, 372, affirmed 163 N. Y., 564; *Havens v. West Side Elec. L. & P. Co.*, 49 N. Y. St. R., 771, affirmed 60 N. Y. St. R., 874; *Hankinson v. Vantine*, 152 N. Y., 20, 29; *De Klyn v. Gould*, 165 N. Y., 282, 286; *Rice v. Culver*, 172 N. Y., 60).

". . . This review of the authorities discloses that the consent

relied upon by the respondent was insufficient to justify the court in holding the land of the university liable to the liens sought to be enforced in this action. Therefore, there was in this case no evidence to justify the trial court in finding that the labor and materials performed and furnished by the lienors were furnished with the consent of the university.

"It thus appearing that there was no evidence which, according to any reasonable view, supports the finding of the trial court, and as the affirmance by the Appellate Division was not unanimous, the question whether there was any evidence to support that finding raises a question of law which the Court of Appeals may review (*Ostrom v. Greene*, 161 N. Y., 353).

"While there were several other questions presented upon the argument and in the briefs of counsel, still, as the judgment must be reversed upon the ground that there was no valid consent by the owner which made its land liable for the liens placed thereon, no discussion of those questions seems necessary. . . .

"The judgment should be reversed and a new trial granted."

The Catholic University Bulletin.

VOL. IX.

APRIL, 1903.

No. 2.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit.* c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. IX.

April, 1903.

No. 2.

JOHANN KASPAR ZEUSS: FOUNDER OF CELTIC PHILOLOGY.

In the investigations on the common origin of the Indo-Germanic languages which took place early in the last century in Germany, the home of comparative grammar, the Celtic branch did not for some time take part. To be sure a good deal was written about that time, in Germany as well as elsewhere in Europe, on the ethnography and literature of the Celts, but these writings are often the work of dilettanti, and although of interest for historical reasons, are for the most part of little scientific value. Among the more notable of the early works, to confine ourselves to Germany, may be mentioned Diefenbach's "*Celtica*" (1839) which, although antiquated, is still of considerable interest for the Gaulish names it contains, and Leo's essay (1845) on the Old-Irish hymn of Fiace in honor of St. Patrick. Even before this Bopp, the founder of comparative grammar, had called attention to the importance of Celtic in the study of Indo-Germanic and in 1838 read an essay before the Berlin Academy on the affinity of the Celtic language with the Sanskrit—but the honor of having inaugurated Celtic Philology belongs incontestably to Johann Kaspar Zeuss whose work, epoch-making in the strictest meaning of the word, the "*Grammatica Celtica*,"¹ is the basis on which the new science has since his time been developed.

¹ "*Grammatica Celtica e monumentis vetustis tam Hibernicæ linguæ quam Britannicorum dialectorum Cambricæ, Cornicæ, Aremoricæ Comparatis Gallicæ priscae reliquiis construxit, I. C. Zeuss, Phil. Dr. Hist. Prof. 1853.*"

This remarkable man was born July 22, 1806, at Vogtendorf, a village not far from Kronach in Upper Franconia, Bavaria, where his father was a master-mason. He attended the village school at Höfles, near by, and was from the first destined for study. His mother often took him with her to the church on the Kreuzberg, near Kronach, and from the priest he received his first instruction in Latin.¹ After he had attended the Latin school at Kronach he was received, in 1820, in the progymnasium at Bamberg where he soon surpassed his fellows in their studies. The choice of his vocation cost him a great struggle, for his mother wished very much that should be a priest, but Zeuss felt that that was not his calling. He attended the Lyceum at Bamberg and the University at Würzburg for a short time and, in 1826, decided to go to Munich. There he devoted himself to linguistic studies, Oriental as well as classical, Slavic and comparative grammar, but his native language attracted his chief attention. Toward the end of his university career he was tutor two and a half years in the house of the Count of Montgelas. He completed his university studies in 1830, and in 1832 was appointed instructor in Hebrew at the old Gymnasium at Munich. This post he held until 1839. His leisure he gave to scientific investigations and, in 1837, produced "*Die Deutschen und die Nachbarstämme*" which, not finding a publisher, he printed at his own expense. In 1838 Zeuss received the degree of doctor of philosophy from Erlangen and in the same year he asked to be appointed professor of Germanic philology, at Würzburg or Erlangen; his lectures, he says in his petition, would be on historical German grammar, the interpretation of Old German texts, northern mythology and Sanskrit grammar. His application was rejected at Würzburg on the ground that other needs had first to be satisfied there and that the establishment of a professorship of Germanic philology was not then necessary; it was refused at Erlangen on the ground that the faculty had not sufficient evidence of the applicant's qualifications for the post. His petition was equally unsuccessful at Berlin.

¹ The material of this brief sketch of Zeuss' life is taken from C. W. Glück's "*Erinnerungen an Kasper Zeuss*," München, 1857. Cf. *Revue Celtique*, VI, 519, *Zeits. f. Celt. Phil.*, III, 199, "*Allgem. Deutsche Biographie*," Bd. XLV.

There his name was well known but he was objected to because of his religion. In 1839, however, he was appointed teacher of history at the newly founded lyceum at Speier where he remained seven years and produced: "*Die Herkunft der Baiern von den Markomannen gegen die bisherigen Muthmassungen*," "*Traditiones possessionesque Wizenburgenses*" and "*Die freie Reichsstadt Speier vor ihrer Zerstörung nach urkundlichen Quellen örtlich geschildert*." From Speier he often went to Carlsruhe, and regularly every Saturday to Heidelberg, where he passed the time in the library, returning to Speier on Monday mornings. In Speier he applied himself with eagerness to the Celtic languages and every year made a journey to London, Oxford, St. Gall, Milan or Würzburg to collect manuscript which contained Celtic glosses. He knew all the libraries in which there was anything to be found on the subject and it was chiefly in order that he might be able to use his savings for gathering material and reaching the goal of his Celtic studies that he remained unmarried. In 1847 Zeuss was appointed ordinary professor of history at the University of Munich, but the Munich climate did not agree with him, and lecturing in the large halls of the university was injurious as he suffered from lung trouble, and after only a few months he was obliged to ask to be reappointed to his former post, or transferred to a milder climate, with the result that in the fall of the same year he was appointed teacher of history at the Bamberg Gymnasium. In 1855 his health failed and he received leave of absence for the winter term; he passed the time at Kronach with his brother who followed the father's trade. The following spring he was at his request retired for the space of a year and passed his last days with his sister in Vogtendorf. He died November 10, 1856, just fifty years old.

Zeuss is described by one who visited him shortly before his death as tall, with black hair and moustache and a Slavonic rather than a German cast of countenance. Great as Zeuss was as a scholar, equally modest was the retirement in which he lived. As a school-boy in Bamberg he seemed shy at first sight but on acquaintance one recognized that it was merely his nature to keep to himself. He took no part in the games of the

boys but found pleasure and delight in study alone. Only in the last years of his university life did he attach himself to a few of the best of his fellow-students. In his maturer years as well he loved retirement; still, he formed a true friendship with the pupil who accompanied him in his career. When a boy he set learning above everything; even so, later, research and science were the air in which he breathed.

Zeuss was already one of the most prominent Germanists of his time when he began more and more to give attention to the study of the Celtic languages and to the great task of Celtic grammar. He thus announces his gigantic work: "It is my purpose to set forth on the basis of the oldest extant monuments, the nature, variety and forms of that language which, of all the related languages that spread from India over Asia and Europe, is farthest to the West . . . not of small importance must that work be considered which shall help us to examine the laws of the language of a people split up, no doubt, ages ago, but once widely spread over Europe, the remains of which, accordingly, are plentiful from the very earliest period and are still represented in the more recent languages."¹ Zeuss began with copying the old manuscripts which contain Celtic texts, he got together the remains of the old Celtic language, the Gaulish, which are scattered in the writings of the ancients, on inscriptions and in other documents; he devoted long and searching study to the Ogam inscriptions and the oldest monuments of the Irish, Welsh, Breton and Cornish, and made himself familiar with their modern varieties. But he gave especial prominence to the Old-Irish:

"In the prosecution of this work which, in the first place, inquires into what were the primitive and common Celtic forms and how the modern variety has arisen from them, the Irish language claims the first place as being, of all the related languages of Europe and Asia, the last, as the island Thule is the farthest west in Europe. It claims

¹ *Linguae, quae inter cognatas linguas ab India per Asiam et Europam dilatatas extrema est in occidente, naturam, varietatem formasque e fundamento monumentorum extantium vetustorum exponere aggredior . . . non parvi etiam erit aestimanda opera ea, qua fiat facultas inspiciendi leges linguae nationis fractae illius quidem iam dudum, sed latissime quondam per Europam patentis, cuius linguae rudera ideo non rara sunt iam a vetustis temporibus, atque hodie quoque extant in aliis recentioribus linguis.*

attention not only because of the greater richness of the Irish form of Celtic but also because of the more numerous monuments preserved in Old-Irish codices which far surpass, both in their number and their subject matter, the British codices of the same age, or, more strictly speaking, the Cymric which alone reach the age of the Irish."¹

The codices which Zeuss made use of and which are the sources of his grammar are, for the Irish, the St. Gall Priscian, the Würzburg Paulinus, codices from the Ambrosian Library at Milan, from Carlsruhe and Cambrai, seven in all, dating from the seventh to the ninth century. Out of this material Zeuss, with consummate skill, created the "*Grammatica Celtica*." The work is admirably arranged so as to show the relations of the Celtic languages to each other, their phonology, formology, word-composition, syntax, the principal verse-forms and specimens from the earliest monuments.

To Zeuss is due the credit of having made known the existence of Celtic linguistic phenomena and of having formulated the laws which have since been elaborated. His work had no forerunners in the shape of separate studies on Celtic subjects and so came as a revelation to those engaged in general comparative grammar as well as to those whose specialties lay in the allied philologies. Few at the time were able to criticise his work. As he was his own teacher so all were his disciples. The Germanic languages had been opened up some time before by Jacob Grimm, and Diez' etymological dictionary of the Romance languages had appeared one month before the "*Grammatica Celtica*," but Zeuss had far greater difficulties to overcome than either of the above for in no field of history or philology had wilder theories been propounded. The "*Grammatica Celtica*" ranks as one of the greatest monuments of erudition and its author as one of the first scholars of the

¹ *Hibernica lingua, extrema et ultima omnium linguarum Europæ et Asiæ a primordio affinium, ut Thule insula est ultima Europæ, in inquisitionibus huius operis, quæ id quaerunt praesertim, quæ fuerint primitivæ et communes celticæ formæ et quomodo ex eis prodierit recentior varietas, primum locum sibi vindicat primamque diligentiam, non solum ob maiorem formarum ubertatem linguæ ipsius, sed etiam ob copiosiora monumenta servata in codicibus vetustis hibernicis, a quibus longe superantur tam numero quam contentorum copia britannici codices eiusdem ætatis vel potius cambrici, qui scilicet soli ætatem hibernicorum attingunt.*

century. John O'Donovan, in a notice on the death of Zeuss, wrote:

"Ireland ought not to think of him without gratitude, for the Irish nation has had no nobler gift bestowed upon them by any continental author for centuries back than the work which he has written on their language."

The "*Grammatica Celtica*" appeared in the year 1853, just fifty years ago, and the progress of Celtic studies during the half century in Germany, where scientific methods have been applied to the languages and literatures of the Celtic people, may be judged from a brief account of the most prominent German Celtists and their most important work. It was inevitable in a pioneer work of such vast extent as that of Zeuss, embracing as it did all the available material from the earliest records of the Celtic languages to his own time, that errors of various kinds should creep in, and Zeuss himself during the three years that he survived the publication of his work had prepared a great deal of matter for its revision and intrusted the preparation of the new edition to his pupil Christian Wilhelm Glück, "*virum unice sibi coniunctum et pietate discipuli et familiaritatis usu*" (Ebel). Glück as well as his master was a Bavarian and studied at Erlangen, Tübingen, Zurich and Berne; he was Zeuss' junior by four years and died in 1866. The work by which he is best known is "*Die bei C. I. Cæsar vorkommenden Keltischen Namen*." Among the letters which Zeuss wrote to Glück during the last three years of his life (mostly answers to questions on the Celtic languages)¹ is one under date of September, 1853, one month after the appearance of the "*Grammatica Celtica*," in which Zeuss already speaks of the need of a new edition of his grammar; again, in 1855, when he found that he himself had not the strength to carry out the work, he wrote to Glück asking him to undertake the latter, but Glück's health, likewise, forbade him to do so and the task fell to Hermann Wilhelm Ebel, in some respects the most illustrious of Zeuss' scholars. He was born in 1820 and his death in 1875 prevented the Celtic course which he had announced for the winter of 1875-6 at Berlin.

¹ These letters have been published in *Zeitschrift für Celt. Phil.*, Vol. III.

Ebel was prominent in comparative grammar investigations; his Celtic studies are to be found chiefly in the volume of Kuhn's "Zeitschrift" and in Bezzenberger's "Beiträge." In his revision of Zeuss he had help in the first place from the *relicta* of the latter and from the works of Stokes and Schleicher, of whom the latter had devoted study to Old-Irish in his works on the comparative grammar of the Indo-Germanic languages. As the result of his constant labor in the investigation of the structure of the Celtic languages the "Grammatica Celtica" was greatly improved: Zeuss's statements were reviewed and supplemented in many ways, errors and omissions corrected, many additional illustrations brought forth and the parts of the work more usefully distributed, so that the Zeuss-Ebel Grammar is an almost entirely new work and the only edition of the "Grammatica Celtica" now referred to.

In the same year as the appearance of this work, that is in 1871, Ernst Windisch lectured on Celtic at Leipzig and during 1874-5 at Heidelberg; since then he has lectured at Leipzig, is the Nestor of German Celtists, and was the teacher of Thurneysen and Zimmer. The place accorded to the Celtic languages in Curtius' "Grundzüge der Griechischen Etymologie" is due to his efforts. His first work devoted to Irish alone, the "Kurzgefasste Irische Grammatik" which appeared in 1879, blazed a way through the mazes of Zeuss, of which it is chiefly a digest, and made the study of Old- and Middle-Irish more accessible. The grammar has been twice translated into English and it would be safe to say that no book has so greatly facilitated the study of Irish. It was not Windisch's intention to make his 'Concise Grammar' an historical grammar of Irish; the bare facts of the language are given, and a few pages of selections from the Old-Irish glosses and the Middle-Irish texts with a glossary thereto. Of even more importance than his Grammar is the chrestomathy "Irische Texte mit Wörterbuch" which was published in 1880 and with it began a new era in the study of Irish—especially of Middle-Irish, to which Windisch has given particular attention; in the work Old-Irish was only a starting point and Old- and Middle-Irish forms are not distinguished. This was probably the most important contribution to Irish lexicography in the last

century, for it brought together and put into a convenient form for the student a mass of material up to that time widely scattered and difficult of access. It contains the Old-Irish hymns from the "Liber Hymnorum" and from the Irish manuscript from the monastery of St. Paul in Carinthia, besides several of the most interesting episodes in prose and verse from the Middle-Irish saga cycles, some here printed for the first time, and one prose text of a religious character, the "Fís Adamnáin" or, Vision of Adamnán. The Irish texts are preceded by notices on the MSS., the sources and variant readings, but the greatest value of the book lies in the rich vocabulary of over 7000 words, occupying nearly two-thirds of the whole volume, with rare exceptions supported by authorities, references, etc. In spite of the severe criticism which the book met with at the hands of some reviewers—it was as extravagantly praised by others—the "Irische Texte" certainly is a work of the first rank, and if it does not "stand next to that of Zeuss-Ebel on the shelves of every Celtist" it is the best-thumbed book in his library. The publication of Irish texts thus begun has been continued since 1884 in the series of "Irische Texte mit Übersetzungen und Wörterbuch" edited by Whitley Stokes and Ernst Windisch, and intended primarily for the publication of the Irish national heroic legends.

Under Windisch Heinrich Zimmer began his Celtic studies and lectured in Berlin from 1878 to 1881 and since then in Greifswald until, in 1901, he was appointed to the newly founded chair of Celtic at Berlin, the only one in Germany devoted exclusively to Celtic, and is consequently regarded as the dean of German Celtologues. His first important writings bearing on Celtic are the "Keltische Studien" (1881) the first part of which is given up to a violent attack on Windisch's "Irische Texte"; in the second part are Zimmer's views, which he has since modified, "Ueber altirische Betonung und Verskunst" which, he says in the preface, he composed in six weeks, working twelve hours daily, or rather nightly, from 4 p. m. to 4 a. m. In the same year appeared his "Glossæ Hibernicæ e Codicibus Wirzburgensi Carolisruhensibus et aliis," with *addenda* and *corrigenda* in 1886, but without translation or index. The work was the occasion for some severe counter

criticism from Celtists in England and France, and has since been partly superseded by the publication of the "*Thesaurus Palæohibernicus*," but it was the first complete edition of the Würzburg Paulinus, which contains the most important of Old-Irish glosses, for Zeuss and Ebel had printed only a small part of it. Zimmer's investigations on all phases of Celtic philology are scattered throughout many scientific journals of Germany and would fill several thick volumes. Most important of all was the discovery of the laws and effects of Irish accent which has necessitated a complete remodelling of Irish grammar.

The credit of having made this discovery is shared by Professor Thurneysen, one of the foremost living Celtists. Rudolf Thurneysen studied under Windisch and Zimmer and lectured on Celtic, first at Jena in 1882-3, and since 1887-8 in Freiburg. In 1884 appeared his first work on Celtic philology, "*Keltoromanisches*," which is of the greatest value to Romanists as well as to Celtists, in which the words supposed by Diez, in his "*Etymologisches Wörterbuch der Romanischen Sprachen*," to be of Celtic origin are critically examined. In collaboration with Bruno Güterbock, who is best known for his "*Bemerkungen über die lateinischen Lehnwörter im Irischen*" published in 1882, he compiled in 1881 the "*Indices Glossarum et Vocabulorum Hibernicorum quæ in Grammaticæ Celticæ editione altera explanantur*" which by its abundant references greatly facilitated the use of the "*Grammatica Celtica*." The first part serves as a commentary on the glosses in Zeuss-Ebel with references to the places of occurrence of each word; the second part is an index of all the Irish words of the "*Grammatica Celtica*." Among Thurneysen's many writings on Celtic subjects (for example the Old-Irish part in Brugmann's "*Grundriss der vergleichenden Grammatik der indogermanischen Sprachen*"), two may be mentioned here, his fundamental study of Middle-Irish metric in the third series of the "*Irische Texte*," consisting of the publication of three metrical tractates on the kinds of poetry, classes of poets and rules of composition, with notes explanatory of the technical terms, and his "*Sagen aus dem Alten Irland*" (1901), a collection of fourteen of the most interesting mediæval Irish tales

translated into German and intended primarily to make known to the German public the richness and variety of Irish literature, and containing valuable bibliographical and literary notices.

In this brief account of the progress of Celtic philology in Germany since its foundation by Zeuss mention at least must be made of the other Celtic scholars, Germans in training at least, who in recent years have added most to our stock of knowledge of Celtic antiquity and civilization; Hugo Schuchardt who has written extensively and, since 1882 at Graz in Austria, has occasionally lectured on Celtic; A. Holder whose monumental work, the "Altceltischer Sprachschatz" first appeared in 1891 and is still in course of publication, a work of vast compass and a wonderful repertory of Gaulish material gathered from inscriptions, documents and quotations from ancient authors; Kuno Meyer, who occupies himself mostly with the Middle- and early Modern-Irish literature; Max Nettlau, best known for his contributions to Cymric as well as to Middle-Irish grammar; the Danish philologist Holger Pedersen, well known in other fields of Indo-Germanic philology, whose most valuable work in Celtic is his "Aspirationen i Irsk"; E. Zupitza, W. Meyer Lübke, Chr. Sarauw, Rich. Schmidt and Fred. Sommer.

It is not surprising that Old-Irish, the most important branch of the Celtic languages for comparative grammar purposes, and Middle-Irish because of the age and wealth of its literature, have been the favorite domain of investigators but the sister languages have not lacked attention from German scholars. To tell those who have advanced the study of Welsh and Breton would be to repeat most of the names already given. In the Gaelic of Scotland Ludwig Christian Stern of Berlin is *facile princeps* and almost alone on the continent; but in Celtic antiquities, archæology, mythology, folklore and law hardly anything has as yet been done in Germany.

The great activity of German scholarship in editing glosses and texts, and in solving the problems of Celtic grammar, made it advisable to publish a German review devoted exclusively to these subjects in addition to the linguistic and literary journals, pamphlets and proceedings of learned societies and

the peculiarly Celtic periodicals of France, Ireland and Great Britain in which the results of their investigations had been, and are still, made public. So in 1896 the first volume of the *Zeitschrift für Celtische Philologie* appeared and in the same year the *Archiv für Celtische Lexicographie*, which is German in title and place of publication, although written mostly in English. The "Archiv" is intended chiefly to be the storehouse of everything relating to Celtic glossology (some Cornish and Breton glosses have already been published) and of the Middle-Irish in particular.

But German Celtists have not been absorbed in the purely linguistic side of Celtic philology to the neglect of the literary history. A great deal of this, however, is almost entirely in the hands of Zimmer, although Windisch and Stern have done much on the Ossianic cycle. Zimmer's views on this question are peculiar and not generally accepted, especially his theory of the great influence on Old-Irish language and saga material of the German, or more strictly Scandinavian, by which he tries to explain the Finn and Ossian stories. The versions of the voyage of St. Brendan have also been studied by him and in Latin-Celtic literature his "Nennius Vindictus" on the authorship, date and transmission of the *Historia Britonum* has been the occasion of many disputes on these and related questions. It is around the "Matière de Bretagne" however that the battle has raged most, *i. e.*, as to how the Celtic material entered French literature. This difficult and important question, since it concerns the Arthurian romances, the Breton lays, the Tristan and Grail sagas and the poems of Marie de France and Chrestien de Troyes, has been debated with very different results by the Celtists, Romanists and English scholars of Europe and America. Zimmer's conclusion, based largely on a study of proper names, and probably not far from the truth, is, in a word, that the Arthurian material arose among the Bretons and that the romanized Bretons, especially those from the bilingual zone of the Armorican peninsula, were the bearers of the traditions to their French neighbors to the north.

It is mainly through the efforts of German scholars that our knowledge of the main facts of Celtic grammar has been

advanced; they have also done much in editing the Old-Irish glosses—the basis for all scientific study of the Celtic languages—which are now nearly all in print, and in publishing mediæval Celtic texts, but many fields are yet untouched and none exhausted. For example the historical syntax of the Celtic dialects has hardly begun and their literary history is only in its beginnings. Although a few excellent collections have been compiled, the vocabulary of Middle- and Modern-Irish is far from being complete, and here each student must be for a time and to a certain extent his own lexicographer. The extent of the field and the abundance of material make this an exceptionally difficult task, while the necessity of keeping as distinct as possible the different periods of the language, and the fact that very few of the texts we have are at first hand but are mostly in the language of different periods and different localities, add to the difficulty. All the efforts of Celtists are concentrated on the historical grammar of the Celtic languages from their beginnings up to and including their modern varieties, and not till that is accomplished will Zeuss' "*Grammatica Celtica*" have been superseded.

JOHN JOSEPH DUNN.

UNIVERSITY OF FREIBURG, BADEN.

THE "PUZZLE" OF HAMLET.

"The Puzzle of Hamlet" is a phrase frequently repeated; and the more "Hamlet" is considered by the critics, the oftener it is repeated, and the reasons for it may be found in the lack of serious study given to the text of this incomparable drama and psychological study, as well as in the neglect by the reader of culture of the contemporary literature of Shakspeare's time. Added to these is the strange habit of guessing at Shakspeare's meaning from a modern point of view. This habit is fixed by the determination of so many persons to read the past as if we possessed the one light capable of illuminating it. It is as if we thought the secrets of old rolls of papyrus could reveal themselves only under the rays of the electric light. Hamlet has been made a puzzle because of our inability to look at the text from the point of view of a contemporary. "'ow could Shakespere 'ave lived in such a nasty 'ouse without h' illuminating gas?" asked a Cockney at Stratford.

In the most scholarly work in the department of English literature, written in the last fifteen years, "A History of Criticism," George Saintsbury says, speaking of the critical necessity of confining ourselves to the actual texts. "This is not perhaps a fashionable proceeding. Not what Plato says, but what the latest commentator says about Plato—not what Chaucer says, but what the latest thesis-writer thinks about Chaucer—is supposed to be the qualifying study of the scholar. I am not able to share this conception of scholarship. When we have read and digested the whole of Plato, we may, if we like, turn to his latest German editor; when we have read and digested the whole of Shakspeare, and Shakspeare's contemporaries, we may, if we like, turn to Shakspearean biographers and commentators."

A fault in much Shakspearean criticism is that it is too reverential. The writer who scans the Bible, alert to find an anachronism or an exaggeration, sprawls at full length before the silliest "sallet" of the Bard of Avon or, perhaps of Messrs. Hemynge and Condell, in rapt admiration. Hysterical girls

after a morning recital by Paderewski are no more ecstatic than some of the Shakspearean acolytes; this blazon ought not to be; it makes Shakspeare an idol hidden in clouds of incense,—an idol to be worshipped as unreasoningly as all idols are worshipped. From what we can discover of the English of the sixteenth century—and no great list of historical references is needed to show this,—we know that they regarded a play as a play, not as an enigma to be thought about, written about, discussed as a problem in philosophy. All the reconstructions of the Elizabethan playhouse show that the auditors went there to weep or laugh, to love the hero and to detest the villain, to applaud the good and to hate the bad. The recent revival of the Catholic morality play, “Everyman,” ought to give us a clue to the truth that the drama in England, from the day of its appearance in the monasteries to the day of its disappearance under the ban of ultra-Protestantism, was made to be seen and heard, not read or strenuously studied. Again, although we talk of the continuity of history, we do not take seriously the truth it implies,—that, in essentials, human nature has always been the same; and that by recognizing these essentials, we get the keys to many things of the past that are closed to us by the unconscious assumption that we are a new order of beings, transformed by the Reformation and experimental philosophy. That the Elizabethans and the Jacobean did not, in the space of a few years, break completely with the beliefs and traditions of the ancient Catholic Church, that they, in spite of the manner in which distance and romance have transfigured them, took a matter-of-fact view of life; and that there were varying shades of belief, opinion and taste are facts that might well be taken into consideration in discussing the meaning of “Hamlet.” No audience will flock to a playhouse to see a tragedy which it does not understand or with which it is out of sympathy. The moralities and miracle plays were almost too obvious for our present taste, but not more than sufficiently obvious for the liking of the English of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries. The dramas of Shakspeare, Fletcher, Chapman, and the rest may contain a cipher. That is another question. It is certain that a noble Earl who liked to listen to music or to mingle with his countrymen of a lower caste at

bear beatings, did not go to see "Hamlet" for the zest of solving any problem, whether in cipher or not!

A lover of Shakspeare recognizing these things, has two quarrels on his hands,—or at least, two reasons for irritation in his mind. One is with the expositor of "Hamlet" who treats the text as a mere matter for the student; the other with the actor, having, in his art, so many means that make for clarity, who uses the play as if his own personality was the first thought, and the meaning of the author the second. To these reasons for discontent may be added,—the disregard of the actor's part in the making of the play by the student and the slavish obedience by the actor, in minor details, to the student. The student forgets that "Hamlet" was written to be acted, and the actor does not recognize that neither philological "guesses" of the note-maker, nor the exact shape of Laertes' cloak are of consequence, provided the value of each character be so expressed that the meaning of the tragedy is full and clear;—if the actor could impress on the student that, if "intuitional" interpretation is to be allowed, he has the advantage, because he is forced in the exercise of his art to take Shakspeare's point of view, we might have less critical dust thrown in our eyes.

There is now no difference of opinion as to the position of "Hamlet" in the literature of the world,—Voltaire having been long ago thrown out of court. Insight into man's heart and mind, and into the fundamental verities which underlie life, expressed in words of piercing beauty and aptness, is acknowledged to exist to an amazing degree; but, if the art-form in which these appear is defective, the symmetry of the masterpiece is affected. In a word, if the play does not answer all the requirements of a play, if it be not interesting and clear, Shakspeare made a serious mistake in adopting the dramatic form. If Shakspeare was not sure whether Hamlet was mad or not, or whether he was noble or not, or whether he loved Ophelia or not, or whether Gertrude had sinned or not, he had the commentators of the future in his mind's eye, and he wrote for them; but, as his utter disregard of the future of his written plays shows that he did not consider the commentators, he must have had in mind an immediate audience. And for the audience of the moment, the dramatist must be sure of what

he wants to say, and must say it with vigor. There have been exceptions, no doubt, but not enough to prove that a so-called drama, of the vagueness of one of Henry James' novels, could hold the attention of normal auditors. From the first, "Hamlet," as a play, is clear and admirably constructed to meet the demands of the London stage of the time.

A glance at the source of the play,—*"The History of Hamblet,"*—connotes the evident purpose of Shakspeare to show that the Prince of Denmark counterfeits madness. Hamblet, in the *"Historie,"* is, however, a very young prince who imitates Brutus, because he knows that his father-uncle, Fengon, suspects that he will avenge his father's murder as soon as he comes of age. He is a Pagan, and he thinks and acts as a Pagan; but Shakspeare was too much of his own time, to be able to project himself into a Pagan mind, and too much of an artist to forego the opportunities offered by a conflict between Christianity and that nature which Edmund, in his famous sololiquy called his "goddess." In this conflict lies the pregnant interest of the play. If Hamlet had Edmund's contempt for any law but Nature's, the play would have lost its deep dramatic interest. In the *"Historie of Hamblet,"* as in Malory's *"Morte d'Arthur"* Paganism shows plainly through the Christian veneering. The translators apologize for this, conscious always of the lack of sympathy in their readers for a Prince, no matter how greatly injured, who would thirst for the mere satisfaction of vengeance. In *"Hamlet"* the Pagan man bursts through the habits of the Christian mind. The young Prince will not kill Claudius at his prayers.

"Not might I do it, pat, now he is praying;
And now I'll do it; and so he goes to heaven,
And so I am avenged? That would be scanned;
A villain kills my father; and, for that,
I, his sole son, do this same villain send
To heaven.
Oh, this is hire and salary, not revenge."

The Pagan writing on the palimpsest has not been entirely effaced. Whether Shakspeare had read the *"Historie of Hamblet"* or not, or whether he founded *"Hamlet"* on an old

tragedy derived from the "Historie," it is evident that he had at least at heart the conflict between Christian law and that lawlessness,—that giving way to natural impulses,—to desire or hatred, knowing no law, which we call Pagan. How coolly too, Hamlet sends his treacherous friends, Rosencrantz and Guildenstern to their death. His excuse would have seemed a valid one to Elizabethans, for the traitorous friends had been privy to a plot for compassing the ruin of one of the royal blood, and the rightful heir to the throne. Horatio is astonished that these two fellow-students should be let go straight to their fate. Hamlet says—

"Why, man, they did make love to this employment;
They are not near my conscience; their defeat
Does by their own insinuation grow."

Hamlet does not doom these traitors to death in madness; it is not madness that makes him spare the king's life until he can think that the murder will plunge him into hell. He is frenzied for the moment when he kills Polonius, behind the arras, believing that Claudius is listening there, nervously overwrought, and in the overwhelming horror of the Ghost's revelation, striving for self-control, until, in the tumult of heart and brain, he seems unbalanced and hysterical, but never, even for a moment mad. The "madness" that he alludes to, in his pathetic words to Laertes, is evidenced in these episodes. It is the loss of that habitual balance which he admires so much in Horatio, who is never passion's slave. "Passion's slave" at times, Hamlet is. In this consists his madness.

Hamlet is essentially noble; he may decline from the law, but he knows, loves and respects it. Claudius, on the other hand, being a man of parts, knows and hates it; he sins and trembles before God, but before man he is every inch a king, in spite of Hamlet's passionate exaggeration of his defects. He accepts evil with open eyes. He would be virtuous, if virtue could be reconciled with friendship for the world, the flesh and the devil. He would be good, if he were not compelled to make satisfaction for evil done to his neighbor. Luther's comfortable doctrine about works had not been preached in Shakspeare's Denmark. Claudius is no mere king of shreds and patches,

though some of the commentators and most of the actors make him so;—as they make an arrant fool or a comic knave of Polonius who was an accomplished Euphuist and a clever prime minister.

It is impossible to enjoy the play as a clear and logical work without keeping in mind that it was written for the theatre, acted under the direction of Shakspeare, and made actual by what the stage-manager in our time would call "business." And this "business" the technical direction for the dumb show or the actions suited to the word, which elucidates the meaning of speech,—must have been as delicately and carefully considered as is every line in the text. The record of this "business" we have lost, and the loss is irreparable. If it existed, the student who looks on "Hamlet" as a text detached from dramatic action would not have had matters so much his own way, and the actor who derives most of his traditions from the practice of other actors of no greater knowledge than himself, would not cause intelligent lovers of Shakspeare to wish that "Hamlet" might never be degraded by the glare of the footlights. Nevertheless, the impulse of the actor to cause the Play to be as obvious as possible has wrought good results. He knows what our critics do not seem always to know, that no accomplished playwright wants to obscure the processes or the objects of his drama, or to convert an "acting play," into an elusive study as Orphic as one of Richard Strauss's symphonic poems. He may,—and he generally does,—neglect every other character in the play to round out that of the Prince; but at his worst, he must regard the action as well as the words. His consciousness of an audience that does not care to think forces him to present effectively what the student refines, re-refines, and over-refines in his closet. Hamlet, with him, is a man, not a mind divorced from a man, and he has not such a superstitious regard for the text that he will allow words to stand merely as words which have no meaning, if not illumined by gesture or facial expression. He makes mistakes at times; in his passion for effects, he overleaps truth,—as when, after the death of Polonius, he weeps and groans in most unprincely fashion. Hamlet says,—

"For this same Lord
I do repent, But heaven hath pleased it so,
To punish me with this and this with me
That I must be their scourge and minister."

At the end of this most dramatic scene, Hamlet "drags in the body of Polonius"—the Queen hurrying away by another¹ door. The actor who should coolly and cruelly obey the stage direction, would bring upon himself the hisses of the auditors and destroy all sympathy for Hamlet, unless it is presumed that he had suddenly become insane. The text of the interview between Hamlet and his mother ought to render that supposition out of the question, although Gertrude, horrified by the effect of the Ghost's appearance on her son,—

"This is the very coinage of your brain,
This bodiless creation ecstasy
Is very cunning in."

She does not see her husband, Hamlet's father, "in his habit as he lived," come to hold the Prince by the bonds of love, to his "almost blunted purposes." "Taint not thy mind," the spirit of the King, suffering, unpurged of crimes, not great in the eyes of men, but "foul" before the purity of God, has said. And now,—not as a king, not as an outraged patriot, seeing with clear eyes that sin is corrupting Denmark, and that the roots of the cancer must be torn out by Hamlet,—but as a suppliant for the soul of the Queen, he comes. That the "illusion was no illusion in the modern sense is shown by the stage direction in the First Folio,—'Enter the Ghost.' " That the Ghost was no hallucination in the beginning of the play, Shakspeare takes pains to prove by the testimony of the soldiers, and, more convincing than all, by the evidence of the clear-minded Horatio. As Hamlet was not mad, the dragging in of Polonius could not have been the only "business" set down for Hamlet after the exit of his mother; and, "severally" is not sufficiently definite. The actor, whose instinct is true, sees this, and supplies the "business" to save the situation. At times he is intemperate,—there have been actors who grovelled

¹ "Exeunt severally; Hamlet dragging in the body of Polonius."

at the feet of Polonius and howled with grief in the most unprincely manner and unphilosophical fashion. The student does not, as a rule, weep at all, or conceive that Hamlet could have wept. He takes the text as it stands, and Hamlet, instead of for the moment assuming a coldness that he does not feel to impress the Queen with the surety of his purpose, becomes brutal in madness. Much of the text of Shakspeare, which seems inconsistent, and is therefore held to have deep and even occult meaning by isolated students simply needs the theatrical "business"—not set down in the first Folio or the Quartos,—to be clear and inconsistent. In minor passages this is very plain. For instance in the First Act when the Ghost passes, and Horatio cries out,—

"I'll cross it though it blast me,"

the "business" explanatory of this is differently interpreted by actors, and though great play is made with the cross-handles of the swords in the swearing scene, the usual method is for Horatio merely to cross the path of the Ghost. The famous romantic player, Fechter, made the sign of the cross, and, as the Ghost did not flinch—as it would have done, had it been an evil spirit,—he went on with his truly Christian appeal to a spirit in a process of purgation:

"If there be any good thing to be done,
That may to thee do ease and grace to me,
Speak to me;
If thou art privy to thy country's fate,
Which, happily, foreknowing may avoid,
O, speak!"

What the actor of the Ghost did in Shakspeare's time, we have no means of knowing. The "business" accompanying Hamlet's

"Look here, upon this picture and on this"

is not even so important, yet it is sometimes a piece of very gross exaggeration. It will never be possible for an actor to insert the "business" in the grave-diggers' scene as described by M. de la Baume Desdosset, when he said that the author

"fait jouer à la boule avec des têtes de mort sur le théâtre." The bowling with death's heads on the stage might easily be introduced to exemplify Hamlet's allusion to the old game of "loggats" by the performers who wanted to accentuate the Gothic and grim humor of the Clowns. Knight smiles at the statement of the exquisite M. Desdosset, and yet some of the "business" introduced by the theatrical grave-diggers is not less grotesque;—and who can conclude that it is really out of keeping in the awful contrast Shakspeare makes? There is, as I have said, the evidence of no prompters' books to the contrary. The taste of the time is the only limit one can set to the grotesque in Shakspeare or in any author of this period. It is evident from the text that the spirit of Shakspeare is against exaggeration of any kind, and the taste of our time is with him. The actor of to-day runs a great risk when, as Laertes, he stands over the body of Ophelia, saturated with the water of the pool and bound by clinging plants, and says,—

"Too much of water hast thou, poor Ophelia,
And therefore I forbid my tears; but yet
It is our trick; nature her custom holds,
Let shame say what it will; when these are gone,
The woman will be out."

Often these lines are omitted, and with reason. The actor is on delicate ground, in uttering what, in our time, seems a bombastic exaggeration. We cannot tell whether Shakspeare softened his rhetoric by "business." At any rate, we can be sure that they were delivered, under Shakspeare's direction, so that they could in no way interfere with the pathos of the moment. The modesty of nature seems to be outraged by them, as they stand in cold print; but who can say that, from the actor's point of view,—which was also Shakspeare's—they were not so presented that, even to-day they would not have offended our taste? In most of our modern plays, every direction is carefully written—no doubt is left by the author in the mind of the reader as to the exact position of any character at any given time on the stage. But these minute directions do not appear in the "reading" edition of the play,—though, as a rule, the literary quality of modern plays is so poor, that

nobody cares to read them. They are arranged for the stage, and when they disappear from the stage, their value likewise disappears. They exist, like the score of an opera by Verdi, or a symphony of Beethoven, only when they are interpreted.

Shakspeare's meaning suffers when his plays are read as if they were intended merely to be read. A poet of the first class, and, consequently, a transfigurer of life, an interpreter of the fundamentals and universals of human character, he chose the form of expression most adapted to the feeling and taste of his time. It has been noticed many times that the limitations of the Elizabethan Play House forced him to adopt a method more akin to that of the modern novelist, than that of the modern playwright. His characters tell us, in their speeches, many things of local and temporal import which, in the modern play are indicated, through the change in the theatrical apparatus, to the sight. The Queen's description of the death of Ophelia, and the poetic expression of Jaques' reveries would be mere "words, words, words," to the theatrical writer of the present day who uses words, in order to make pictures as seldom as possible. When Gower enters, at the beginning of the fifth act of "Pericles," he asks the auditors to do what the novelist often asks his readers to do—to "make believe," to "suppose."

"In your supposing once more put your sight,
Of heavy Pericles think this his bark,
Where what is done in action, more, if might,
Shall be discovered; please you sit and hark."

The audience of to-day neither "supposes" nor "sits and harks." It sits and sees. Shakspeare could not adopt his plays to the modern theatre without destroying their literary value. At the same time, they would have lost their power of appeal to the folk of his time, were they literature only, and not dumb show, at times, and very vigorous action as well.

The characters of Regan and Goneril in "King Lear" seem to be monsters of evil without any attractive traits. They are so wicked that many lovers of Shakspeare have classed them as theatrical puppets created as foils to Cordelia. And it must be confessed that the bare text gives this impression,

for there are few phrases concerning them that suggest to the imagination that they are more than twin creatures wedded, unhumanly, to sin. Edmund, too, seems unhuman,—a thing of no compunction, a pawn of the author's to bring out one of the emphatic lessons of the play that sin blinds us to the truth,—that both Lear and Gloucester suffered because, wedded to their pet sins, their minds had grown so darkened that they could not distinguish truth from falsehood. But neither Regan nor Goneril is a mere puppet. Regan and Goneril differ in attributes. Albany calls Goneril "a gilded serpent"; and, on this hint, the actor should build. Goneril and Regan are too often treated as evil twins, in no way different, except in their love for Edmund. As for Edmund, he is most dependent on the actor, the text is full of subtle hints, not always considered by either the reader or the personater. Edgar says,—

"The gods are just, and of our pleasant vices
Make instruments to plague us;
The dark and vicious place where he thee got
Cost him his eyes."


And Edmund replies,—

"Thou hast spoken right, 'tis true,
The wheel has come full circle; I am here."

Dying, Edmund goes back, in triumph, to his sin again,—

"Yet Edmund was belov'd;
The one the other poisoned for my sake,
And after slew herself."

Edmund is a character created for the actor, and it requires all the art of artful actors to interpret his subtlety. The puzzle-questions as to Edmund—is he an atheist?—is he not a mere creature of circumstances?—become quite plain when Edmund appears in flesh and blood, with a will to choose nature as his goddess, and a belief, at least in nature's law. Iago himself, a self-degraded and super-subtile soul, is, too, only human in the actor's hands. His plottings, read in cold blood on the printed page, make him seem to be simply a devil, sojourning for a time on earth in human form.



On the other hand, the theatre has a way of being careful in minor details, which are often stifling to the imagination, and careless in more important things not considered by a certain class of modern novels. A manager who prides himself on the minutiae of a gondola in "The Merchant of Venice" or on the fidelity to detail in the view of a Venetian street in "Othello" will cut out those most important lines in the speech of the Ghost in "Hamlet,"—

"Unhousel'd, disappointed, unaneled."

The seem unimportant to that reader of Shakspeare who cannot conceive,—being without present knowledge or historical data,—their terrible meaning

"Unhousel'd, disappointed, unaneled

No reckoning made, but sent to my account,

With all my imperfections on my head;

O, horrible! O, horrible! most horrible!"

The spirit's heart-wrung exclamation is that he died without the last sacraments, disappointed of his rights as a Christian, unshriven, without Extreme Unction. The statement affects Hamlet terribly; we learn it later in the play. Hamlet broods on it, and he does not keep in mind that the Ghost is not a lost soul, though suffering the pains of purgation; that he thinks only of those pains we know well from his soliloquy over the praying Claudius. Less archæology and more art,—more attention to the conditions of minds in the Play would do away with the aspersion that the theatre, in the United States, at least, has "no historical sense."

The accent laid by the spirit of the elder Hamlet on his loss of the rites of the Church had its value, we may be sure to the auditors of the Globe Theatre. It has its value to-day, not only to persons who have the "historical sense," but to many who can see—whether we admit that Shakspeare's conception of the Ghost was strictly theological or not—that he realized what was meant by the cutting off of a Christian soul from its rights. Again, the Polonius of the modern theatre is a cross between a knave and a fool. It is true that Hamlet calls him a fool, but Hamlet, in his fits of passion, is not to be trusted. His

picture of his uncle, for instance,—“Hyperion to a satyr”—and his underrating the qualities of a courageous, cool, highly intellectual, but deliberately bad man, as Claudius was, ought to show the representators that Hamlet’s estimate of Polonius should be taken only as the estimate of an overwrought, almost maddened and supersensitive soul. Polonius was shrewd; a closer study of the Euphuists and the influences that made him possible, would prevent the actors,—or the managers,—from misrepresenting his creator’s idea.

In the “Chorus” of the first act of “Henry V,” when Shakspeare despairs of crowding the splendid pageant of Agincourt into the Theatre, he exclaims against the limits of the stage,—

“Can this cockpit hold
The vasty fields of France? or may we cram
Within this wooden O the very casques
That did affright the air at Agincourt?
O, pardon! since a crooked figure may
Attest in little place a million;
And let us, ciphers to this great accompt,
On your imaginary forces work.
Suppose within the girdle of these walls
Are now confined two mighty monarchies,
Whose high upreared and abutting fronts
The perilous narrow ocean parts asunder:
Piece out our imperfections with your thoughts;
Into a thousand parts divide one man,
And make imaginary puissance;
Think, when we talk of horses, that you see them
Printing their proud hoofs i’ the receiving earth.”

As a rule, Shakspeare adapts his dramas to the bounds of his theatrical world without any evident dissatisfaction with them. In fact, if his means of satisfying the sight had been greater, our pleasure in reading his plays would be less.

No better example can be found in “Hamlet” of the loss the student suffers from the absence of the “business” used by the actors in the days of Elizabeth and James than in the first scene of the third Act. Hamlet has unveiled his doubtful mind, and suddenly he sees Ophelia. A flood of sudden tenderness sweeps over his heart. “Soft you now!” he says.

“The fair Ophelia! Nymph, in thy orisons
Be all my sins remembered.”

It almost seems as if the wide-spread delusion that Hamlet is really mad was founded mainly on this scene,—for here, unless some adequate reason for his suspicion of Ophelia’s truth could be given to the auditors, he seems to be not only mad, but possessed of a brutal and sullen devil. It is enough for the close student of the play to believe, after careful comparison of various parts of the text,—that Hamlet had come to distrust all women and that he was vowed “to wipe away all trivial fond records”; but it is not enough for the average auditor, and we may be sure that there was some “business” arranged to explain obviously the Prince’s outburst of wrath, after a moment, too, of extreme tenderness. The stage direction is simply “*exeunt King and Polonius.*” But where do they go for their “lawful espial?” Behind the arras? Into a gallery at the back of “a room in the castle”? The author sees that their presence must be made known to Hamlet, in order that he may have an excuse for acting the part of madness with such brutality. He must have some plain proof that Ophelia is playing upon him for the benefit of her father, and the auditors,—according to the usage of the stage,—must know that he has this proof; therefore, it is the custom, in many stage presentments of the Play, to reveal accidentally, for a moment, the presence of the King and Polonius. The insults of Hamlet,—excusable only in a madman or one feigning madness,—are directed then, not at the fair and gentle Ophelia, but at the listeners.

“I did love once,” he says with a breaking voice, and he adds, remembering, “I love you not.”

“I was the more deceived,” Ophelia answers gently.

Then Hamlet, fearing his own weakness, frightens Ophelia with his accusations against himself. Her gentle face appeals to him, and puts her to the test,—

“Where’s your father?”

“At home, my lord.”

There is no relenting after that. He loves her still, but he knows that she has deceived him. To the winds he flings his

wrath; the listeners must believe him mad, and she—"frailty, thy name is woman!"

Considered as a play, treated as actors of intelligence, who desired simply to bring out its meaning, would treat it, "Hamlet" ceases to be a puzzle. It must be remembered, however, that, until the "historical sense" is cultivated in the theatres, light thrown on certain passages by the actor's instinct and insight will not pierce other passages equally worthy of illumination.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

HARNACK AND HIS CRITICS.

Since the days of Strauss and Renan no other book has so deeply stirred the world of theological thought as Harnack's work on the essence of Christianity—"Das Wesen des Christentums."¹ The lectures which make up the volume were designed to give a clear and concise account of the Christian religion, to show what it was in itself and what in the vicissitudes of history it has become, and to define its bearing on the pressing problems of the day. Although three years have passed since the lectures were delivered, the interest aroused by them has been steadily on the increase. In Germany alone nearly thirty thousand copies of the work have been sold. The book has been translated into most of the languages of Europe, and wherever it has gone its appearance has been the signal for a storm of controversy.

The profound impression produced by this book is easily explained. Here we have in the compass of a few hundred pages the latest answer of modern critical study to the question, "What is Christianity?" In a little volume packed with thought and free from pedantry we have the ultimate convictions of a man who is widely regarded as the foremost critic of the age, writing on a subject to which he has devoted his life and which is a theme of perennial interest to all reflective minds. The book marks an epoch in religious speculation. It raises every momentous issue and sharply outlines every vital problem in the range of Christian belief; it passes judgment on almost every disputed point in the origin and history of the Christian faith. It is one of those books that from time to time compel men to take their theological bearings anew.

"Das Wesen des Christentums" is divided into two parts. The first part deals with the Gospel in itself—the origin of Christianity in the teaching of Christ; the second part deals with the Gospel in history—the historic development of Chris-

¹ "Das Wesen des Christentums." Von Adolf Harnack, Fünfte Auflage, Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1902.

References are to the English translation of the work: "What is Christianity?" by Thomas Bailey Saunders, 2d ed., New York; Putnams, 1901.

tianity in the ages. In both parts the aim is to arrive at the real message of Christ, to discover under alien accretions the innermost essence of Christianity, to find "the Gospel in the Gospels." All this is more commonly expressed in the formula rendered familiar to the public by Abbot, Harnack, Sabatier and Gardner: to separate the kernel from the husk. The first part of the work is that to which critics have chiefly devoted their attention, because it contains the latest word of higher criticism on the essence of Christ's message, and because on the conception which we form of the meaning of this message must depend the value of the judgments that we formulate on the development of the Church, of its dogma and worship.

As authorities for Christ's teaching Harnack accepts only the Synoptics—"Everything that we know independently of the Gospels about Jesus' history and His teaching may be easily put on a small sheet of paper, so little does it come to" (p. 21). The first three Gospels, he concedes, are substantially reliable; they are not, indeed, historical works in the consecrated sense of the term, but neither are they "party tracts." The scholarship of two generations has undone the work of Baur and Strauss and restored in its main outline the credibility of these documents. We now know that they belong to "the palæontological age" of Christianity. They embody, it is true, miracle narratives, but to reject documents simply because they contain such "unhistorical elements" would be "a piece of prejudice." All that is needful is to separate the kernel of fact from the husk of miracle, and this may be done by a comparison of sources and by the exercise of the critical faculty. "Do not let yourselves be deterred because this or that miraculous story strikes you as strange or leaves you cold. If there is anything here that you find unintelligible, put it quietly aside" (p. 32).

With the Gospels Harnack professes to deal simply and solely as a historian. He enunciates, however, a principle which is hardly a historical assumption and which is prophetic of difficulties to come. The Gospel in itself, he avers, is "simple"; so simple is it that "no one who possesses a fresh eye for what is alive and a true feeling for what is really

great, can fail to see it and distinguish it from its contemporary integument" (p. 15). We shall see to what use Harnack puts this principle. Meantime it is not clear how in respect of method he differs from Tolstoi, who in his rough and ready way decides offhand what Jesus said and did, or from Schmiedel who can discover only nine absolutely credible passages in the Gospels.

It is on the question of miracles that Harnack's critics first join issue with him.¹ Harnack rejects miracles: "We are firmly convinced that what happens in space and time is subject to the general laws of motion, and that in this sense, as an interruption of the order of nature, there can be no such thing as miracles" (p. 28). The Gospel miracles, in particular, he finds beset by special difficulties, for miracle as it is now understood was wholly foreign to the minds of the fisher-folk of Galilee. These simple people had no clear conception of what a miracle is because they had no clear conception of what a law of nature means. They were men of their time, having no adequate idea of what is possible and what is impossible. Hence miracles, which once attested the truth of the Christian religion, have become serious stumbling blocks to faith.

Harnack's critics do not waste time in discussing the question whether the ancients understood that there is an order of nature—the importance which men of Christ's day attached to miracles seems to be a sufficient answer. They hasten to point out that in discarding miracles Harnack involves himself in an illogical compromise. That Strauss and Renan should have given short shrift to miracles is intelligible; the one was a Hegelian, the other a Positivist, and both frankly investigated the origin of Christianity in the light of their philosophical systems. But that Harnack should be convinced that miracles do not happen is not so easily understood, for Harnack holds that the world of nature and the world of history are under the rule of Divine intelligence. He will admit that, in Kant's famous phrase, man is a member of a kingdom of ends; he protests that we are not shut up within a blind and

¹ Walther: "Ad. Harnack's *Das Wesen des Christentums*," Leipzig, 1901.

brutal course of nature. But to acknowledge that a God exists who rules and governs and who may be moved by prayer, and to be convinced that there can be no such things as miracles—this seems to be a strange compromise between naturalism and supernaturalism. It is felt that whoever holds Christianity to be non-miraculous abandons what ultimately distinguishes historical Christianity from impersonal theism. Moreover, on the assumption that God can visit His people—an assumption which cannot be set aside by one who emphatically denies that we are yoked to an inexorable necessity—miracles, so far from being improbable, become eminently probable. Indeed, granted that the Incarnation is a fact, there is only one miracle to be accounted for; all the rest are only accompaniments, the absence of which would have been still more wonderful than their presence. The strange thing would be that Christ, being what He claimed to be, did not perform “works none other did,” whether as credentials of His claims or as the simple outpouring of His majestic Personality.

Again, when Harnack puts miracles aside he invokes at the outset of his inquiry a philosophical principle that decides questions at issue before historical criticism can be brought to bear on them. Whether an event has taken place or not must be determined, not on *a priori* grounds, but on the testimony of those who are competent to bear witness. Thus, whether Christ was born at Bethlehem in the manner described in the Gospel of St. Luke is a matter of evidence; it must be determined according to methods adopted by such men as Ramsay, not according to methods pursued by those who set aside the infancy narrative because they have already eliminated God from history. When, therefore, Harnack states his conviction that miracles do not happen, he formulates a principle that even his vast knowledge of antiquity does not teach him, and that vitiates, or rather renders superfluous, any discussion of the most vital problems of Christianity.

Further, it is asked: how can Harnack give up miracles and logically stand for the historical character of the writings that embody them? The Gospels are homogeneous documents. They present throughout a most august idea of the super-

natural, and constitute from the first word to the last a consistent history of One who "did mighty works because God was with Him." They exhibit a sanity and sobriety of statement that in other documents would be taken for a guarantee of truth, and the miracles which they report are at least as soundly attested as any other events in the biography of Jesus. By what right, then, does Harnack distinguish in such documents two strata, one historical, the other unhistorical? How can he, without tearing the Gospels to shreds, remove from them miracles, woven, as the miracles are, into their very web and fibre? Even Strauss was more logical than Harnack in this matter, for Strauss saw the futility of trying to save the historical character of the documents while repudiating miracles: "If the Gospels in general be admitted as historical, it is impossible to eliminate miracles from the life of Jesus." In view of the difficulties in which Harnack so cheerfully involves himself by shelving miracles, we are painfully struck by the flippancy of his exegetical canon: "If there is anything here that you find unintelligible, put it quietly aside."

Harnack next falls foul of his critics on the question of the Fourth Gospel. In any discussion of sources this burning topic at once presents itself. What Harnack thinks of the much debated document is well known. He has worked his way back to the traditional date of the Gospel: "not after 110 and not before 80." He is not, however, willing to ascribe it to the pen of St. John; he is still less willing to take it as an historical authority in the ordinary sense of the term. Indeed, "it can hardly make any claim to be considered an authority for Jesus' history" (p. 22). The author was probably John the Presbyter, a younger contemporary and disciple of St. John. Whoever he was, "the author acted with sovereign freedom, transposed events and put them in a strange light, drew up the discourses himself and illustrated great thoughts by imaginary situations" (p. 21).

Against such a summary dismissal of the Fourth Gospel several competent authorities have taken the field. Professor Sanday enters an "emphatic protest" against what he terms

¹ "Leben Jesu" (1864, p. 18).

“the sweeping and unjust language” of the German professor.¹ Dr. Gore, after reviewing the present state of the Johannine problem, avers that there is to-day less reason for rejecting the Gospel than there was a generation ago.² Others point to the unbroken ranks of authorities who defend the substantial authenticity of the book and who belong to all schools of thought, liberal as well as conservative. Harnack’s critics do not blink the difficulties which arise from contrasting the Fourth Gospel with the Synoptics. They are wide awake to the differences of scene and theme and style—to the change from Galilee to Judea, from simple chronicles and parables to discourses on life and light and truth. They make full allowance for the apparent discrepancies which seem to show that the writer of the Fourth Gospel was reminting his materials rather than narrating what he had seen with his eyes and gazed upon and handled with his hands. But they appeal confidently to the external evidence which does not grow less cogent with the discovery of new fragments of early Christian literature. They appeal with no less confidence to the internal evidence which indicates in many ways that the Gospel is the story of one who knew whereof he wrote, and who, besides, possessed a large conception of the significance of what he saw. The very contrast which is the only real objection to the Gospel does not, they argue, weaken, if it does not strengthen, the cause for Apostolic authorship. It reveals that the purpose of the writer was to supplement what had been written, and to afford a deeper insight into the words and deeds of Christ—to give a view of our Lord’s life from within that all may know “that Jesus is the Christ, the Son of God.” Hence it is that what is of common tradition is passed over in silence, what is obscure in the Synoptics becomes clear, what is latent there takes shape in the great “spiritual Gospel.” The sense in which Christ fulfilled the prophecies is more amply illustrated; the claims which Christ made are expanded; the filial relation is more abundantly explained; in a word, the underlying thought of the first three Gospels is

¹ “An Examination of Harnack’s ‘What is Christianity?’” London, Longmans, Green & Co., 1901, p. 7.

² *The Pilot* (London), February 22, and March 1, 1902.

elaborated with a wealth of detail. The story that John tells is the old story newly told—told by one who, as he moves among the scenes which he describes, looks for the spiritual significance of it all. The picture of Christ is the old picture—painted too from life, but by one who consciously strove to bring out the Divine lineaments of the Saviour. The Fourth Gospel stills holds its place as the crown and culmination of the Synoptics and as the only explanation of the life and thought of the early church. “With it, and not without it we can attain to some consistent notion of what Christ was and did.”⁵ And with it also, and not without it, does the history of the early days of Christianity become intelligible.

A French critic of “*Das Wesen des Christentums*” points out that what separates Catholic scholars from Protestant theologians of the liberal school lies not so much in divergences of exegesis as in the philosophical principles with which they respectively approach the study of the Scriptures.⁶ This seems to hold true in the present instance, for, as Professor Sanday says, “the real objection to the Fourth Gospel is an objection to the supernatural generally.” It can hardly be doubted, at all events, that in handling the Johannine problem Harnack has laid himself open to the charge which he so lightly levelled against the writer of the Gospel: he has certainly “acted with sovereign freedom.”

In setting forth the teaching of Christ in systematic form Harnack chooses three central ideas. These are: the Kingdom of God and its coming; God the Father and the infinite value of the human soul; the Higher Righteousness and the law of love. These ideas taken collectively or singly, he maintains, contain the sum and substance of Christ’s message. “They are each of such a nature as to contain the whole” (p. 55). It will be enough, therefore, to consider the first “category” of the Christian religion.

From time immemorial the conception of the Kingdom of God was deeply rooted in the consciousness of Israel—early in its career the nation had become a theocracy in the true sense of the word. Hence, the history of Old Testament Revelation

⁵ Strong, “*Historical Christianity*,” London, Henry Frowde, 1902.

⁶ Père Léonce de Grandmaison in *Études*, March, 1902.

is justly said to be a history of the Kingdom of God developing among a people ever mindful of its unique destiny as a people chosen by God. The Kingdom of God was variously conceived in the varying fortunes of the race, but it never lost its essential character as a Kingdom of Righteousness. In the prophecies and the psalms we come upon the most sublime, because the most spiritual, conception of the divine commonwealth. In later Judaism the notion became despiritualized, so that in the age immediately preceding the coming of Christ it was largely a vision of national blessedness—"a dream of apocrypha and apocalypses."

In the New Testament the Kingdom of God occupies a place no less prominent than that which it held in the Old Testament. Indeed, Christ made it the burden of His preaching—His first words struck the keynote of His message to men: "Repent, the Kingdom of God is at hand." His Gospel was "the Gospel of the Kingdom"; the Kingdom was the theme that He put on the lips of the disciples when He sent them forth to preach—"And going preach saying the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand." It was the secret of the Kingdom He explained to His disciples to whom "it was given to know the mysteries of the Kingdom of God." It was around the same doctrine the parables centered; the laws of the Kingdom were formulated in the Sermon on the Mount. The coming of the Kingdom was the most devout aspiration of all who prayed as He taught men to pray. Christ's last commission was in keeping with His great message—it was virtually to push forward the frontiers of His Kingdom to the uttermost bounds of the earth.

The doctrine of the Kingdom Harnack explains in accordance with his principle that "God and the Soul, the Soul and God," is the whole content of the Gospel. The Kingdom of God as taught by Christ is simply the communion of the soul with God—"the inner link with the living God." It is "a purely spiritual blessing" permeating and dominating the whole existence of the individual. The Kingdom of God as it has been commonly understood, with its consummation in the hereafter, Harnack sets aside. Such a view is the "traditional" view, current in the Old Testament and common in the

days of Christ. It is the husk, the kernel being the communion of the individual soul with God.

Harnack's method of interpreting a doctrine which he takes to contain the whole of Christ's teaching has been received with much surprise. To reject as husk what is traditional, simply because it is traditional, and to retain as kernel what is Christ's own in Christ's message, is regarded as a novel and arbitrary canon of exegesis. It appears the more arbitrary when we reflect that the new order introduced by Christ emerged from the old, for Christ came not to destroy, but to fulfill. The Kingdom of God, therefore, which He placed in the forefront of His preaching, simply embodies the spiritual elements of the commonwealth foreshadowed by the men of old time. It begins, indeed, with the individual, inasmuch as it is a principle of divine rule working in the hearts of men, working from within outward, and working to transform life and all its varied relations. But this is only the Kingdom in its beginnings. It is also an external reality, a society developing slowly, according to the rhythmic law of growth, into a world-wide communion of those who hold communion with God through Christ. The scene of the Kingdom of God is now not the individual soul of man but all humanity—"the field is the world." And yet, this earthly Kingdom which has come upon men is only the counterpart of an eternal Kingdom of God—that "eternal life" of which Christ spoke to the young man who had great possessions. This is the true Kingdom of God. It is the goal towards which the individual is striving and in which alone communion with God is consummated. It is also the culmination of the royal rule of God in the world—the final realization of the reign of God on earth. It will be inaugurated with a judgment, "that day" which was so often on the lips of Christ, when the Son of Man shall come in the glory of His Father with the angels, to reward every man according to his works. And thus the Kingdom of God is to see God both now and hereafter; now as sons by faith, then as sons in possession of their inheritance.¹

If Harnack is properly censured for rejecting as husk what was traditional in Christ's message of the Kingdom, he is no

¹ Cf. Robertson's "Regnum Dei." London, 1902.

less justly criticised for identifying the Kingdom of God with the reconciliation of the individual soul with the Father. Nowhere in the New Testament does this "inner link" exhaust the complex content of Christ's great message to the world; nowhere is the reconciliation anything more than the condition of admission to the Kingdom. The text upon which Harnack lays so much stress in support of his view: "the Kingdom of God cometh not with observation . . . the Kingdom of God is within you" (Luke, XVII, 20, 21), is susceptible, as is well known, of an interpretation other than that which Harnack gives it. And even if the words identified the Kingdom with "a still and mighty power in the hearts of men" there are many other passages which are more clear and which round out the full conception of the Kingdom as Christ preached it. To lay the burden of proof upon a text which may be interpreted in different ways, and to sacrifice the rest of the Gospel to the interpretation of such a text—this is what Abbé Loisy calls going against the most elementary principles of criticism.

It is upon the problem of Christology that theological interest chiefly turns; Harnack's answer to this question of questions is in keeping with the Ritschlian principle that bars metaphysics out of religion. A doctrine of Christ's Person, he holds, forms no part of Christ's Gospel: "The Gospel as Jesus proclaimed it is a Gospel of the Father, not of the Son." Jesus was a man, feeling, praying, toiling, struggling, suffering like other men, making no claims for Himself, exacting no faith in His own Person—such is Harnack's Christology. True, Jesus claimed to be the Messiah; so much the Berlin professor concedes against Wellhausen, but what he gives with one hand he takes back with the other: Jesus claimed to be the Messiah simply because it was necessary to do so in order to gain recognition within the lines of Jewish history. True, also, Jesus claimed to be the son of God; but this title in turn Harnack empties of significance. "Son of God" does not mean that Jesus claimed to be the divine Son of a divine father: "rightly understood the name of Son means nothing but the knowledge of God" (p. 138). To support his interpretation of a phrase which has been a standing formula for the divinity of Christ, Harnack turns to the classic text of Matthew: "No

man knoweth the Son save the Father: neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal Him." From this passage Harnack concludes: "the consciousness which He possessed of being the Son of God, is, therefore, nothing but the practical consequence of knowing God as the Father and as His Father" (p. 138). Needless to say, exegesis so arbitrary has provoked the sharpest criticism. Abbé Lagrange asks whether the Fatherhood of God is constituted by knowledge of the Son as the Sonship of Jesus is said to be constituted by knowledge of the Father.¹ The text which Harnack has mishandled has always been regarded as an incomparable expression of the intimacy, the absolute intercommunion existing between Father and Son; to stint and limit the content of it as Harnack does is to do injustice to the plain meaning of the words as they stand. To this same passage Justin appealed of old as proving Christ to be "the first begotten of God who submitted to become man." Even some of Harnack's forebears and compeers, as little trammelled as he by reverence for tradition, have always found in it much more than the human consciousness which Christ had of the Father. It would seem, therefore, that once more Harnack has "acted with sovereign freedom," and that in a matter of vital moment.

He has, moreover, left entirely out of account the startling claims which Christ made and which obviously should be reckoned with in a chapter on Christology. Wherever we open the first Three Gospels we come upon claims which are intelligible only on the ground that Christ stood in a supremely unique relation to the Father. Jesus fulfills the law and the prophets. He is the Saviour of souls. He is the final Judge of human actions and human motives. He forgives sin. He is the supreme and final Revealer of truth. With a word He sweeps away whole enactments of legislation regarded as divine. He makes demands on men's minds and consciences, such as no one had ever dared to make. He promises rewards for deeds done in His name. He is to be loved by all and above all. He is to be worshipped. Claims such as these—

¹ *Revue Biblique Internationale*, January, 1901.

and they are only some of the claims put forward by Christ—are in ill accord with the assertion that a doctrine of Christ's Person finds no place in the Gospel.¹ They are claims that could have been put forward only by One who was conscious of a higher Sonship than that with which Harnack is content—by One who had the inherent right to concentrate upon Himself the reverence of humanity, and to exalt Himself far above the message which He brought. They show that, as Von Hartmann says, the essence of Christianity is in the Person of Christ if anywhere at all, and they prove that a Christianity such as Harnack has assayed from the Gospel—a Christianity without a Christology—is not the Gospel as Christ taught it. Fairbairn voices the conviction of scholars when he says: "Jesus in asking 'whom say ye that I am?' consciously confesses that His religion will be as His Person is conceived to be."²

Harnack is positive that no doctrine of Christ's Person is to be found in the Gospel, and yet he finds such a "doctrine" there. He bases his view on a single text—a vice of exegesis that was supposed to be the apanage of a certain class of theologians. He leaves out of account a score of passages which even the most critical of the critical could not ignore, and which manifestly assume a Filiation far transcending the Sonship of his interpretation. Such exegesis as this will not enhance Harnack's reputation for scholarship; it surely exposes him to a suspicion which is the last that a historian should be willing to incur.

Jesus "was declared to be the Son of God with power by the Resurrection from the dead." To the Resurrection, then, Harnack turns, as must every historian who deals with the essence of Christianity.

The New Testament, Harnack asserts, distinguishes between the Easter Message and the Easter Faith (p. 173). The Easter Message is the empty grave and the appearances of Jesus; the Easter Faith is the conviction that Jesus "lives as the first fruits of those who are fallen asleep." Now, he says, the story of the empty tomb must be set aside. No eye rested

¹ Köhler: *Gehört Jesus in das Evangelium?* Leipzig, 1901.

² *The Philosophy of the Christian Religion*, p. 395.

upon the Resurrection—a few women and disciples “looked into” the sepulchre and believed that the resting place was empty. Then rumors began to rise and men and women took to seeing visions. It was upon the appearances, not the empty grave, that the apostles laid stress, and of these appearances it is impossible to construct a clear and consistent account: “Who of us can maintain that a clear account of these appearances can be constructed out of the story told by Paul and the Evangelists; and if that be impossible, and there is no tradition of single events which is quite trustworthy, how is the Easter Faith to be based on them?” (p. 174).

And yet, he insists, we must cling to the Easter Faith although we reject the Easter Message; we must hold to faith in the Resurrection though not to the fact of the Resurrection. That Jesus lives does not depend on the story of the tomb and the appearances; it is certified for us by “the vision of Jesus’ life and death and by the feeling of His imperishable union with God” (p. 176). The New Testament itself, Harnack declares, requires belief in Christ’s triumph over death without the message of the vacant tomb. Were not the disciples on the road to Emmaus blamed for not believing in the Resurrection, even though the Easter Message had not reached them? Is not the story of Thomas told for the very purpose of reminding us that we must hold the Easter Faith even without the Easter Message? Did not Paul—who perhaps knew nothing about the empty grave—found his Easter Faith upon the certainty that “the Second Adam” was from heaven and upon an inner revelation coupled with vision?

It is obvious that Harnack’s views on miracles determine his views on the Resurrection: “if the Resurrection meant nothing but that a deceased body of flesh and blood came back to life, we should make short work of this tradition” (p. 173).

Now, passing over the fundamental prejudice against miracles with the remark that criticism does not tell us what may and may not happen, Harnack’s critics declare that his theory of the Resurrection ignores almost everything that needs to be explained and blunders in almost every explanation it offers. It ignores the despondency of the disciples which was deepest at the very moment when rumors of the

Resurrection began to rise. It ignores their stubborn refusal to believe that the tomb was empty until they had entered into—not “looked into”—it, and their still more stubborn refusal to believe the first accounts of the Resurrection. It supposes too much in assuming that the disciples on the road to Emmaus had not heard of the Easter Message, for the news of the empty grave had reached them and they spoke of it. It supposes still more in asserting that Thomas was rebuked for refusing to believe, although he had not heard the Easter Message, for he was manifestly rebuked for his lack of faith despite all that he had heard concerning the Resurrection. As to Paul: the man who preached that Christ “was buried and rose again the third day,” who founded his proof for the Resurrection of the body on the Resurrection of Jesus, who enumerated the various appearances of the risen Christ—surely Paul is the last witness who should be called to bear out such a theory of the Resurrection as Harnack offers. Finally Harnack’s objection that no clear, consistent account can be constructed of the appearances of Christ is so trite that it is almost disregarded. Discrepancies in detail even when read, point to the substantial truth of a narrative and prove that there has been no collusion to tell the same story in the same way. Harnack’s entire treatment of the Gospel account of the Resurrection has proved a surprise both to friends and foes. It is taken as showing that a man may be a brilliant historian and yet a very indifferent exegete. The explanation he offers leaves the ancient dilemma where it stood: to deny the Resurrection of Christ is to intensify rather than relieve the mystery of His Personality. As Professor Swete very well says: “The intellectual difficulty of believing the Resurrection of our Lord’s Body to be a baseless story will always be greater than the intellectual difficulty of believing it to be a substantial fact.” The question, therefore, still remains to be answered by Harnack: “Why should it be thought a thing incredible with you that God should raise the dead?”¹

Into the second part of Harnack’s work there is no need to enter. Here he studies in the school of time how, as Lessing would say, the religion of Christ became the Christian religion.

¹ The Expository Times, February, 1903.

He interprets the history of the Church in the light of the "reduced" Gospel which he has found in the Gospels. It is a story of degeneration and decadence, of Hellenizing and Paganizing that he traces through the centuries. The history of the Church is, from his point of view, the history of one long blunder.¹

The aim which Harnack kept in view throughout his lectures on the Essence of Christianity, was to make easy the path of faith for thousands who "would fain see Jesus" but who stumble at the fundamental facts of the Christian creed. In carrying out this purpose he has manifested the exalted spirit of reverence for which he is distinguished among the scholars of Europe; from time to time the historian becomes the impassioned pleader in behalf of Him who alone "satisfies the longing of which St. Augustine spoke," and Who, alone, is "the center of the religious history of the race." He makes his own the words of Goethe and writes upon them many a glowing page of commentary: "Let intellectual and spiritual culture progress, and the human mind expand as much as it will; beyond the grandeur and the moral elevation of Christianity as it sparkles and shines in the Gospels the human mind will not advance." If we shall hear no more of the crude and flippant methods of criticism which Strauss and Renan brought to bear upon the Gospels, if there is more reverent scholarship to-day in Berlin than at any previous time in the history of higher criticism, this is largely due to the "Mommсен of modern theology."

And yet, as the results of his work are more clearly seen in their proper perspective, the more plain does it become that he has not only failed in what he set out to accomplish, but has also given a cruel blow to the cause which he wished to serve. For Catholics "*Das Wesen des Christentums*" has a melancholy interest. In it they see the inevitable outcome of the Augsburg Confession which contained from the beginning, the potency of chaos.² They follow the German professor step by step, tracing as they go the influence of the theological bias which he brings to the study of the various problems. They take occasion to remind him that the very data upon which he

¹ *Der Katholik*, August, 1901.

² Reinhold: *Das Wesen des Christentums*. Stuttgart und Wien, 1901.

works have been given him by tradition; that the Gospel which he preaches is not the Gospel which Peter and Paul preached; that the Christ whom he depicts is not the Christ of the Gospels. They affirm once more that no man can separate Christ from His works—that the historical Christ is the miraculous Christ. The Evangelicals view Harnack's book with dismay; into their ranks he has carried consternation. They charge him with having betrayed the very citadel of Protestantism and undermined the foundations of belief. In pamphlet and pastoral conference they continue to condemn him, declaring that his lectures "meet the demands neither of history nor of the true Gospel, nor of human want." Only among Jews and infidels has Harnack's book found favor—for them the Berlin theologian has forged a weapon which they have not been slow to use. Like Schneider¹ of Mannheim they declare Harnack's lectures "a splendid justification of infidelity," or like Mehring,² the social democrat, they proclaim with exultation that Christianity has received its death blow in the house of its former friends.

It is among the bewildered souls for whom he wrote that Harnack's disastrous failure will be most evident. As they examine what he offers them as Christianity, they see a religion without creed, without miracle, without supernatural sanction or inspiration, without answer to the problems which vex the souls of men—without anything for the spiritual and intellectual demands of the age. Instead of a supernatural religion they find only the bare essentials of natural religion. For, to save Christianity Harnack has jettisoned the supernatural; it is as if to save a ship from foundering he would throw the engines overboard. The Christianity in which the world has any interest is Christianity with the Incarnation and the Resurrection; the Christ Whom men need is the Christ Who not only showed how a human life may be lived divinely, but also rose from the dead. Instead of the Christianity for which men crave, Harnack offers little more than what the Rationalism of the eighteenth century bequeathed; and instead of the Christ whose history began with a miracle and ended with a miracle,

¹ *Das Freie Wort*, 1901, Nr. 4.

² *Die Neue Zeit*, 1900, Nr. 4.

he gives only one who was born as other men are born, and died as other men die. True, for some people he has, in this manner, removed difficulties from the path of faith, but he has done so only by leaving them nothing to believe in. The lectures on the essence of Christianity have eliminated everything that the world deemed essential to Christianity, and have left nothing in the place of what they have taken away.

The latest attempt to reconceive the Christ has ended as all such attempts in the past have ended. Since the beginning of the nineteenth century shadowy Christs have been floating before the eyes of men like the shadowy kings before the eyes of Macbeth. To this long line of unreal and unsubstantial Christs another has been added: like the rest it will vanish into thin air and leave behind nothing more than the memory of its presence.

HUMPHREY MOYNIHAN.

THE ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

BIBLIOGRAPHY OF THE CONTROVERSY.

I. BOOKS AND PAMPHLETS.

- Rupprecht.** Das Christentum von Ad. Harnack nach dessen sechzehn Vorlesungen. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1901.
- Walther.** Ad. Harnack's "Wesen des Christentums" für die christliche Gemeinde geprüft. Leipzig, Deichert.
- Schick.** Ist das "Wesen des Christentums" von Ad. Harnack in 16 Vorlesungen wirklich des Wesen des Christentums? Regensburg, Wunderling, 1901.
- Cremer.** Das Wesen des Christentums. Gütersloh, Bertelsmann, 1901.
- Rolfs.** Harnack's Wesen des Christentums. Leipzig, Hinrichs, 1902.
- Ehrhard.** Der Katholizismus und das 20 Jahrhundert. Stuttgart und Wien, 1901 (passim).
- Strong.** Historical Christianity the Religion of Human Life. London, Frowde, 1902.
- Bäck.** Harnack's Vorlesungen über das Wesen des Christentums. Breslau, 1901.
- Lemme.** Das Wesen des Christentums und die Zukunftsreligion. Gr. Lichterfelde, Berlin, Runge, 1901.
- Köhler.** Gehört Jesus in das Evangelium? Leipzig, Deichert.
- Wolff.** Ist Harnack's "Wesen des Christentums" ein Ergebnis geschichtlicher Forschung? Kassel, Röttger.
- Lasson.** Das Unwesen des Pseudo-Christentums. Gr. Lichterfelde, Berlin, Runge.
- Kaehlbrandt.** Vier Vorträge über das Wesen des Christentums gehalten im Winter 1900-1901. Riga, Jonck u. Poliewski, 1901.

- Baumann. Neuchristentum und reale Religion. Bonn, Strauss, 1901.
- Perles. Was lehrt uns Harnack? Frankfurt a. M., Kauffman, 1902.
- Freimaurerische Betrachtungen über Harnack's Wesen des Christentums. Vom Verfasser von "Christentum, Humanität und Freimaurer." Berlin, Stankiewicz, 1901.
- Reinhold. Das Wesen des Christentums, eine Entgegnung auf Harnack's gleichnamiges Buch. Stuttgart u. Wein, Roth, 1901.
- Abert. Das Wesen des Christentums nach Thomas von Aquino. Würzburg, 1901.
- Sanday. An Examination of Harnack's "What is Christianity?" London, Longmans, Green and Co., 1901.
- Saunders. Professor Harnack and his Oxford Critics. London, Williams and Norgate, 1902.
- Loisy. L' Evangile et L' Eglise. Paris, Picard, 1902.

II. ARTICLES AND REVIEWS.

German (Non-Catholic).

- Theologische Studien und Kritiken, 1901, Heft 2. Study by Albrecht.
- Der Beweis des Glaubens, May and June, 1901. Articles by Zöckler.
- Deutsch-Evangelische Blätter, 1901, Heft 4. Articles by Haupt on the Easter Faith.
- Theologische Rundschau, 1901, Heft 3. Review by Bossuet.
- Die Gegenwart, 1901, No. 1. Article by von Hartmann.
- Monatschrift für Stadt und Land, 1900, Heft 10. Article by Nathusius.
- Hannoversche Pastoralkorrespondenz, 1901, No. 4. Review by Wöhrmann.
- Der Alte Glaube, 1900, No. 49; 1901, No. 13; Nos. 34-36; Nos. 43-46. Articles by Wollenberg and Gussmann.
- Die Christliche Welt, 1900, No. 46. Review by Drews.
- Chronik der Christlichen Welt, 1901, No. 29; 1902, No. 4.
- Allgemeine Evangelisch Luteranische Kirchenzeitung, 1900, Nos. 42, 43 and 52; 1901, Nos. 16, 17, 18, 36; 1902, No. 36.
- Das Freie Wort, 1901, No. 4. Article by Schneider.
- Die Neue Zeit, 1900, Nos. 29-30. Articles by Mehring.
- Kirchliche Wochenschrift, 1901, Nos. 16-17. Articles by Lasson.
- Evangelische Kirchenzeitung, 1901, No. 2. Article by Wolff.
- Monatschrift f. d. kirchl. Praxis, 1901, Heft 1. Article by Baumgarten.
- Neue kirchliche Zeitschrift, 1901, Heft 1. Article by Burger.
- Theologische Litteraturzeitung, 1900, No. 21. Review by Schultz.
- Deutsche Litteraturzeitung, 1900, No. 1. Review by Holtzmann.
- Litterarische Rundschau f. d. evang. Deutschland, 1901, No. 3.
- Die Hilfe, 1900, No. 38. Review by Neumann.
- Christliche Bücherschatz, Jahrg 22, 23. Article by Otto Krauss.

German (Catholic).

- Der Katholik, July and August, 1901. Articles by Joseph Adloff.
 Stimmen aus Maria Laach, January, 1901. Review by Chr. Pesch, S.J.
 Zeitschrift für katholische Theologie, 1901, No. 25. Review by Leop. Fonk, S.J.
 Natur und Offenbarung, 1900, No. 46. Review by Franz Strung.
 Kölnische Volkszeitung, 1900, Nos. 739, 746; 1901, No. 467.
 Renaissance, January and February, 1902. In February issue, Dr. Schell's critical study.
 Freie deutsche Blätter, October 19, 1901.
 Pastor Bonus, 1901-2; pp. 1-9.
 Christliche Akademie, November, 1900.
 Münchener Allgemeine Zeitung, 1901, Nos. 28 and 29. Articles by F. X. Kraus.

French.

- Revue Biblique Internationale, January, 1901. Analysis by Abbé Lagrange.
 Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne, 1901, August and September. Articles by J. de Coussanges.
 Revue de Théologie et de Philosophie, November, 1900.
 Revue Chrétienne, June, 1901.

English and American.

- The Bibliotheca Sacra, July, 1902.
 The Expository Times, October, 1900.
 The American Journal of Theology, January, 1903.
 The Biblical World, December, 1901.
 The Critical Review, November, 1900.
 The Churchman, October 26, 1901.
 The Quarterly Review, January, 1903. (Art. XII.)
 The Expositor, November, 1901.
 The Christian World, February 28, 1901.
 The Inquirer, Marc., 9, 1901.
 The Times, August 15, 1901.

OLD TESTAMENT CONCEPTS OF EARTHLY WELFARE.

The views of earthly possessions which spiritual guides and philosophic teachers take, must necessarily be governed by their ideas of a supra-earthly life. According to beliefs concerning the hereafter, the goods of this world must logically be regarded. In the light of these views they will be held either as desirable in themselves—an end to be striven for and fully enjoyed in the brief span of human life—or, on the other hand, by reason of their use or abuse, as mere helps or hindrances to a future existence far above the plane of material pleasures. So, too, the popular attitude must be tinged, at least on its theoretic side, by the conviction of the masses concerning retribution beyond the grave. Even though rigid consistency be wanting, as is often the case, there is a close and necessary relation between the eschatologies of a people and its religious leaders, and the mental attitudes of the same towards material goods. Therefore, to comprehensively know and justly estimate the views on this point of both the Hebrew people and their spiritual teachers, as expressed in the Old Testament, we must glance at Hebrew eschatology in its various phases. In order, moreover, that Israelitic attitudes towards property may have their historical settings, and because they not only reflect but were influenced by the existing economic conditions, a brief account of the material status of Israel in the various periods of its national life will be useful and pertinent.

I. THE ESCHATOLOGICAL CONDITIONS.

It is necessary to distinguish between the two chief divisions of Jewish Old Testament history, viz., before and after the Exile, though there is such a shading off in the development of the doctrine of immortality that we cannot say that the Exile draws a sharp line between the older and newer beliefs. In both epochs, it is also imperative to distinguish, at least in some important features, between the popular, gen-

erally prevalent conceptions of the future state, and the aspirations and intuitions of favored, sometimes inspired souls, who rose above the common level. Both currents of thought run through the Old Testament literature.

(A) *Before the Exile.*—It cannot be gainsaid that the ancient Hebrews had no definite hope of a recompense, either good or evil, beyond this present life. For the masses death meant the descent of the soul into Sheol, that universal rendezvous of the dead, where good and bad, high and low, suffered the same lot, buried in a vague, vast subterranean abyss, where they subsisted imperfectly, in a sluggish torpor or half-sleep. There they rejoined their fathers, but in the earliest literature of the Israelites, as far as we are able to assign it, there is scarcely a hint of deliverance from this dark and sad abode.¹ In the divine economy the doctrine of immortality, was to grow and unfold slowly and painfully through the ages till it received its finishing and confirmation from the lips of Christ and the revelations of the Holy Spirit. Yet the idea of retribution was most firmly rooted in the Israelitic mind from the beginning. For every violation of divine law a forfeit was due to God's justice and holiness. Death was the punishment of all-pervading impersonal sin.² If Sheol was regarded as a penalty at all, it was as one for the sinfulness of humanity, and not for the transgressions of individuals. The logical corollary of the juxtaposition of these two principles: the absence of judgment beyond the tomb, and the imperativeness of retribution, was a third broad principle, viz., that God rewards and punishes in this life, and that therefore, well-being, that is, spiritual, material and social prosperity, is the reward of righteousness, while misfortune and suffering are the penalty of evil-doing and the signs of God's displeasure. This is the general broad principle which prevails, more or less, throughout nearly the entire Old Testament literature.³

And yet it raised such grave and perplexing problems,

¹ See "Le Developpement de la Doctrine de l'Immortalité," *Revue Biblique*, April, 1898; cf. article on Eschatology in Hastings. "Bible Dictionary."

² Gen. II, 17; III, 19. Cf. Romans, V, 12-14.

³ See "The Problems of Well-Being and Suffering in the Old Testament," *Biblical World*, April-May, 1896.

when confronted with the actualities of life, wherein the just are often miserable and the wicked or godless triumph and prosper, its application demanded so many exceptions and modifications, that this law of divinely ordained relation between righteousness and well-being, unrighteousness and suffering, must always—except, perhaps, in the infancy of the people—have had little more than a merely theoretic truth for the Israelites when applied to individuals. On the other hand, the history of the chosen people, as a whole, is a striking example of the truth that offending *nations* feel the weight of God's just wrath in time, since it is only in time they exist.

The pious Israelite of old, if he had enjoyed a long life and a goodly share of prosperity; if he had "possessed the land"—always an important factor in his happiness, if his barns were well-stored, and he left behind a numerous and loving progeny, at the close of his days deemed himself in the favor of Yahveh, and sufficiently rewarded for his faithfulness. He would "go to his fathers," to gloomy Sheol, it is true, and his spirit must have shrunk from that future of darkness and semi-extinction, but he found consolation in the thought that he would still live in his children and posterity and his name would be held in honor.¹

Yet the Israelite who had striven to serve Yahveh and keep his law, but whose portion was one of affliction, who had felt the bitterness of injustice, or the sting of poverty, whose life perhaps had been one of physical torment or discomfort—such a one must have been profoundly troubled and cast down, especially when he saw his oppressor, or the wicked man batten in ease and riches. Cruel, indeed, must have been the problem of suffering to such upright souls, of whom Job is the type. This man's hopeless and agonizing life wrung from him in his despairing moods poignant complaints against the seeming failure of God's justice. Such a one must at times have felt with the Psalmist,

"Surely in vain have I cleansed my heart,
And washed my hands in innocence;
For all day long have I been plagued,
And my chastisement was every morning."²

¹ Cf. Ps. CXII (Vulgate CXI), 1, 2; Eccclus. XL, 19; Is. LVI, 4, 5.

² Ps. LXXIII (LXXII), 13, 14.

But Job, seeing dimly a ray of light, hoped against hope that somehow God would in the end lift him out of his misery, and bring him into His joy-giving Presence.¹ So, many religious souls, tortured by the enigma of life, rebelling against the universal application of the law of earthly retribution, must have faintly trusted, that their consciousness of communion with God would survive the present life, that perhaps by some marvel of divine power they would be redeemed from Sheol, and receive recompense for all their woe, by sharing in the endless bliss of the Messianic reign or some more transcendent intercourse with Yahveh. It needed such a deeply religious nature as that of the Israelites, with their instinctive sense of the essential justice of God, and lowly reverence for His mysterious dispensations, to keep alive faith and moral rectitude in this dark period of early Hebrew eschatology, when the hope of a better life was only a flickering spark.

Yet, it was out of such perplexities and half hopes that this eschatology grew into something more definite and comforting. Thoughtful minds sought a solution, and hopeful aspirations for deliverance from Sheol into a divine life began to find expression. The problem of the prosperity of the unrighteous and the sufferings of the just led, too, to a higher estimate of purely spiritual goods. The tender relationship on earth between the soul and God, often and touchingly expressed in the psalms, was found to be in itself a great reward.

"Thou art my refuge,
My portion in the land of the living."²

Psalms XXXVII, LXXIII, are the inspired utterances of souls wrestling with the problem of inadequacy of temporal retribution, giving voice to their aspirations, and hoping the "larger hope" of ultimate blessedness in the afterlife. It is probable that both are pre-exilic in date, but whether or no, as we shall find kindred thoughts among the pre-exilic prophets, it is not too much to say that before the Exile, the development of the doctrine of a future life had begun to shed abroad rays, though feeble, of gloom-dispelling light.

¹ At least according to probable interpretations of XIX, 25, 26; XIII, 15.

² Ps. CXLII (CXLI), 5; cf. Ps. XVI (XV), 2, 5.

The prophets dealt with nations, and classes of men. They entered into no study of the problem we have been describing. The judgment of God, they predict, is a judgment upon the whole people. The resurrection that Ezechiel beheld, prefigures, as he tells us, the restoration of Israel.¹ And indeed, up to the Captivity, an Israelite with the exception of chosen spirits here and there, such as some of the psalmists, could hardly conceive of an individual religious life and responsibility apart from those of the community. He was absorbed, so to speak, by the theocracy as he had been in public and social life effaced by the clan or tribe. So the eschatology of the prophets is almost wholly a national eschatology. The retribution they constantly preach is that of the judgments which shall precede the Kingdom of God; in the literal sense of their utterances this Messianic reign was not to be devoid of earthly elements, though these would be transformed and renewed. Only indirectly did the prophetic warnings and exhortations touch the individual. It is significant of the little prominence which the idea of the personal retribution had yet gained, also of the ineradicable sense of an omniscient and avenging God of holiness and justice, that the prophets hold out no reward for individual virtue, but that of escape from death at the invaders' hands together with a vague blessedness and "life"; while as a sanction against wrong-doing they appeal only to the everlasting righteousness of God, and a sharing in the popular calamities. Once indeed, another and surprising note is heard: Isaias proclaims that the just Israelites shall rise from the dead to share in the joys of the Messianic reign, and the stress of the passage seems to bear upon individuals.²

The catastrophes of the Captivity, by dissolving the nation and the organic solidarity of the people, brought out strongly the relations of God to the individual and a consequent personal responsibility. When the kingdoms and theocracies had ceased to be, the individual found himself spiritually face to

¹ Ez. XXXVII, 11.

² Is. XXVI, 14-19; cf. Orelli, "Old Testament Prophecy," p. 303; Riehm, "Messianic Prophecy," 2d ed., p. 276.

face with God. The religious unit in the Exile was not the nation but the person. Ezechiel announced that henceforth everyone must stand or fall on his own merits.¹ He is the one *prophète* who insists upon personal righteousness and holiness, independent of that of the community, while not losing sight of the truth that there is a certain oneness between rulers and people, between the nations and their individual members. This important step in advance prepared the way for a personal eschatology.

(B) *After the Exile.*—Whether or not it be true, as some critics maintain, that contact with Persian theology hastened the development of the Jewish doctrine of the future life, we find in post-exilic books a notable progress of ideas. Still, this is not immediately evident. The old conceptions were deeply rooted, and the post-exilic prophets, Malachias, Aggeus, Zacharias, address their messages chiefly to classes, or to the whole people, and the future they sketch is that of the community in the Messianic kingdom. The Messianic eschatology and that of the individual went on developing side by side, till they were gradually merged into one, by the latter appropriating to itself the retributions of the Messianic days, previously related only to nations and collections of men. The wisdom-literature belonging to the earlier part of the period after the Captivity concerns itself with the transcendence of Wisdom and its application to the affairs of daily life. But in the deeper spirituality of the Psalms we encounter a marked advance in eschatological thought.² Here the problem of the prosperity of the wicked is solved by their evil end, and by the deliverance of the just from Sheol into life with God.³ In Pss. XVI and XLIX the crucial stage of perplexity to which LXXIII and XXXVII bear witness, is no longer encountered. Instead, there is a triumphant assurance that God will translate the spirit of the just from the living death of Sheol, which

¹ Ezechiel, XVIII. The idea had been announced but not developed by Jeremias, XXXI, 29-30.

² Pss. XVI (XV), XLIX (XLVIII), 13, ff. Compare XXXVII (XXXVI), 27, 28, XXXVI (XXXV), 8-9; and XXII (XXI), 14, "man whose portion is in this life."

³ See Kirkpatrick, "The Book of Psalms," 1902, p. 273; *Etudes*, November, 1899, p. 340 ff.

is to be properly the lot of the wicked. And the writers do not speak for themselves alone: they are types.¹

The second book of Machabees, probably written in the first century before the Christian era, gives evidence of immense progress in the doctrine of the future life. The answer of the seven martyred brothers to the tyrant presiding at their tortures, and the exhortations of their heroic mother, are animated by an assurance of a resurrection of the faithful and a reward for their constancy in the afterlife.² Those of the just who die without having been fully cleansed from sin, can be delivered from these impediments to the joys of the resurrection by the prayers of the living.³ The ultimate fate of the wicked is left obscure in the Book of Daniel which is regarded by recent critics, including a few Catholic scholars,⁴ as composed in the Machabean era, but we encounter an otherwise highly developed doctrine in chapter XII, 2, 3, the only passage in the proto-canonical books where resurrection and retribution after death are clearly taught, and the sole mention in the entire Old Testament of a resurrection of the unjust.

The eloquent passages of the Book of Wisdom (II-V) describing the persecution of the just man by the evil, and the consternation of the latter on beholding his glory in the after-world, also mark an advanced stage of progress in eschatological teaching. Here the heavenly reward of virtue is clearly taught. "The just shall live forevermore and their reward is with the Lord." The fate of the wicked is not so definitely expressed, but "they are consumed in their wickedness."⁵

Wisdom and Daniel hold, in general, the highest levels of the Old Testament eschatology, but the former, if not both, belong to the advanced period of Jewish theology comprised in the two centuries preceding Christ. The progress of Old Testament ideas of immortality, which we have cursorily traced from its obscure rudiments to the comparatively full development represented by Wisdom and Daniel and Second Machabees

¹ See Kirkpatrick, "The Book of Psalms," 1902, p. 273; *Etudes*, November, 1899, p. 340 ff.

² II Mach., VII.

³ Ib., XII, 43-45.

⁴ Cf. *Annales de Philosophie Chrétienne*, October, 1902, *Revue Biblique*, April, 1898, p. 228.

⁵ Wisdom, V, 16, 13.

is instructive and interesting. Yet how slowly the conception of future rewards and punishments made its way among the masses may be seen in the second chapter of the late book of Wisdom where the unrighteous are represented as basing their sensual enjoyments and cruelties upon a materialistic view of life, a mixture of Epicureanism and the old unbelief in personal reckoning hereafter.

II. THE MATERIAL CONDITIONS.

The darkness concerning human destiny which prevailed in the minds of the Israelites before the Exile and for some time after, naturally gave to the tangible present good of earthly possessions an attractive and overwhelming force. The *summum bonum* seemed to be the things of this world. Indeed, only the deeply rooted religious-ethical consciousness of the people which had been awakened into energy by Moses, and was kept alive by the prophets, an instinct which found its embodiment and fixed expression in the Law given or sanctioned by Yahveh—this alone prevented the Israelites, as a people, from wallowing in the slough of materialism depicted in the second chapter of Wisdom. As it was, lust of gain and pleasures ruled the upped classes in the time of the later kings. A brutal overriding on their part of the rights of the poor and weak, a ruthless exploitation of the ill-defended classes, is plainly written in the denunciations of the prophets. The infection extended to those whose duty it was to administer justice and vindicate the laws of God. "The heads thereof (Jerusalem) judge for reward, and the priests thereof teach for hire, and the prophets thereof divine for money." "The rulers eat the flesh of the people and flay the skin from them."¹ There is a reiterated outcry from the inspired prophets against unscrupulousness in trade, against the exactions, the injustice and the violence of the rich.

It had not been always so in Israel. The Jews of to-day are the descendants of a simple nomadic folk who drove their flocks in the desert and lodged under tents of skins.

¹ Micheas, III, 11, 2.

The settlement in Canaan made a revolution in the habits and life of these wanderers, which was the more rapid as they came into possession of a country whose inhabitants had reached a notable degree of civilization. The Israelites became an agricultural people, and remained such through all the vicissitudes of their history as a nation. They were unfitted for trade, both by their nomadic life in the past and the situation of their newly-conquered country, hemmed in, as it was, on all sides by enemies, and cut off from the sea and its ports, except for the brief space in which the tribe of Zabulon held possession of a strip of coast. On the other hand, the land answered generously to the labors of the husbandman and stock-raiser. Its valleys and lower levels were fertile, especially in the northern half; its hillsides were adapted to vine-growing, and where the soil was semi-desert and unfruitful, large flocks of sheep and goats could find sustenance. The good wheat and barley harvests and the herds were ample to support the population with its few and simple wants.

At first trading was left in the hands of the Canaanites, close kinsmen to the Phoenicians, and inheritors of their genius for commerce. Forced from the soil, they turned actively to a mercantile life. The term "Canaanite" remained for a long time a synonym for merchant.¹

The Israelites tilled the ground or kept their flocks. Their modest wealth lay in the fruits of these industries. The mass of people was thus composed in the early period of a middle class of peasant-proprietors, equally removed from want and luxury. Saul, himself, the newly chosen king, did not disdain, even after his elevation, to follow the plough and cultivate the paternal acres.²

Nevertheless, the monarchy, itself the token of a higher civilization, reacted upon the hitherto simple, patriarchal life of the people, and brought in an element of complexity and social inequality. It also gave an impetus to trade, yet not before Solomon had expanded David's moderate establishment, and made Jerusalem the capital of a splendid Oriental despotism. Luxuries were now in demand. An increase

¹ Sophonias, I, 11; Ezech. XVI, 29; Prov. XXXI, 2, 4.

² I Samuel, XI, 5.

of wants created an increase of traffic. Nearly all costly articles had to be imported from the opulent and busy Phoenician emporiums, Tyre and Sidon, or from Damascus and Assyria, by the caravans whose route lay across northern Israel. Solomon himself had the commercial instinct, as is proven by his dealings in Egyptian horses and chariots,¹ and his expeditions to Ophir, though these last were probably only to supply gold for the Temple and luxuries for the court.²

Thus it came about that Israelites, learning from the Canaanites, began to be skilled in crafts of the humbler kinds, as pottery, smith-work, weaving, baking. They embarked upon the currents of world-commerce which streamed through their land in two great caravan-routes. The third book of Kings (XX, 34) casually reveals the fact that the northern kingdom, always the representative Israel in a material sense, had important trade relations with Damascus. The fertile areas of Palestine produced a surplus of grain, oil and balsam, which was consumed by mercantile, densely populated Phoenicia. In return, the latter sent its fine fabrics and articles of luxury. Palestine became the granary of Phoenicia, and probably through Phoenician middlemen, carried on an export trade in its surplus wheat.³ But despite these trade developments, the Israelites always remained essentially an agricultural people.⁴ The tilling of the soil was held in eminent honor, and the well-to-do residents of cities and towns generally owned farms, vineyards or pasture-lands, to which they gave attention personally or through stewards.⁵ How strong were the fibres which rooted the ancient Jew to the soil of his fathers is strikingly seen in the story of Naboth's vineyard which the owner refused to sell, even to the king. Commerce always remained a secondary element in Israel's economy, except in so far as it was based directly upon the products of the earth.

As well as the limited data permit us to judge, it was Israel's extensive grain trade with Tyre and Sidon that—

¹ III Kings, X, 28, 29.

² Ibid., IX, 26-28; X, 11, 12, 22.

³ Cf. Ez., XXVII, 17.

⁴ See Buhl, "Die socialen Verhältnisse der Israeliten," 1899, pp. 65, 66.

⁵ Cf. Sam., XII, 1, ff.

much more than the monarchies and royal officialdom—broke up the old approximate social equality which had held in the era of the Judges, and that of the beginnings of the kingdom.¹ This equality rested upon a relatively equal distribution of land. As a consequence the body of the Israelites were an agrarian middle-class. But in the age of the later kings the growing dimensions of the grain exports whetted the avarice of the rich, and induced them to enlarge to the utmost by fair means or foul, their holdings of a soil which had become so remunerative. They took advantage of the seasons of dearth, caused by war or failure of crops, to press their peasant creditors and force them to part with their mortgaged farms.¹ Thus arose landlordism and concentration of wealth in the hands of relatively few. The numbers of the comfortable middle class were reduced, and the poor were multiplied.

The influx of money from the grain-trade brought in a money-economy, a commercialism which soon heightened and emphasized the social inequalities, for by these new factors in Israel's industrial life the upper class profited in great disproportion. All the advantages were on the side of the wheat-jobbers and the land monopolists. Socially the distance between the more and the less prosperous widened rapidly. The poor found themselves isolated in their miserable villages in a state of serfdom to the lords of the soil. Having lost their land and become too straitened to redeem it, they were now forced to subsist at the mercy of the larger proprietors, or seek a precarious livelihood in cities. The rise in the price of food products, caused by the selfish hoarding of grain for export and speculation, intensified the distress of the proletariat. In many cases they were obliged to sell into slavery their children or themselves, in order to obtain the necessities of life.³

Thus the commercial development of the nation ended in the rise and dominance of a moneyed aristocracy, at once

¹ See Walter, "Die Propheten in ihrem sozialen Beruf und das Wirthschaftsleben ihrer Zeit," 43 ff.

² Osee VII, 14, Is. V, 3; Mich. II, 1, ff. Cf. Neh. V. The accumulation of the land of poor agrarian creditors is a common source of the rise of classes in antiquity. See Adler, *Geschichte des Sozialismus und Kommunismus*, 6.

³ Amos, II, 6, 7; Is. III, 12; cf. Neh. V, 2, 5, 8.

grasping and oppressive, whose wrongdoings were shielded by corrupt rulers and judges. The victims on whose blood they fattened constituted a class without property, a proletariat, whose existence was a portent unknown in the older days of Israel, and whose condition was the more helpless inasmuch as they were without the rights of citizenship,¹ bare and defenceless before the greed of the "mighty." So we find that in the second deportation to Babylonia there were left in Judah only the utterly poor, those destitute of real property. These alone found comfort in the catastrophe, for they came into the occupancy of the vacant lands and houses.²

Between the capitalists and the poor was a shrinking middle class, composed on the one hand of small freeholders,³ struggling against absorption by the magnates, and on the other of well-to-do tradesmen, established in cities and town. The royal officers, military and civil, formed another element, closely allied to the agrarian and financial aristocracy. They often abused their power of gathering tribute, to exploit the much-suffering commonalty. The king himself, even when he had the will, which was rare,⁴ could check but not prevent the widespread oppression of the weak and poor by the "mighty."

The Exile did little to abate the covetousness which had become one of Israel's crying national sins. The old spirit of soulless greed soon reappeared after the Return. In the stress of political and social restoration, the poorer people were forced to borrow money and grain from the "nobles and the rulers" and being unable to pay the usurious interest, they saw their mortgaged houses and fields, and even their children, fall into the hands of the exactors. It took the angry intervention and generous example of Nehemias to redress these evils.⁵

The sojourn of many Hebrews in the industrial and trading centres of Babylonia, Assyria and Persia, after their violent uprooting from the soil, compelled them to learn trades and handicrafts and further stimulated the awakened commercial tendencies of the race. It was now that Jews for the first time

¹ Buhl, "Socialen Verhältnisse, etc.," p. 45.

² IV Kings, 25, 12; Jer. XXXIX, 10.

³ Cf. Jer., XXXII, 7.

⁴ Jeremiah, XXII, 16, mentioned as a noteworthy fact that King Josias "judged the cause of the poor."

⁵ Neh. V.

entered into money-trading and became bankers. At first confined to the Dispersion, this new feature of Jewish life extended itself in time to the fatherland. The first minted coins came into use during the Persian domination, the Israelites having previously used, as mediums of exchange, only weighed pieces of gold and silver. In Jerusalem, after the Exile, artificers and tradesmen were numerous and important enough to form guilds, which had a status resembling that of the clans, and enjoyed corporate rights and privileges.¹

But after the Captivity the fuller operation and more liberal provisions of the Law in favor of greater equality, must have bettered the condition of the poorer classes. The population steadily increased, and despite the wars and persecutions, which ravaged the country, prosperity gradually reappeared. So we find a sacred writer describing the rule of Simon Machabee as a golden age.² It was then that fertile Galilee was reunited to Judea. The producing power of Palestine in the time immediately preceding Christ is strikingly evidenced by the enormous taxes the population was able to pay to foreign rulers and the Temple service, without suffering exhaustion.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

¹ Buhl, *op. cit.*, pp. 75, 43. Cf. Neh. III, 8, 31; I Par. IV, 21.

² I Mach. XIV, 6-15.

THE MINING QUESTION.

The recent Anthracite Coal Strike has given to the mining question in the United States a prominence which is exceptionally welcome. The strike was a calamity; the suffering which it entailed and the uncertainty which it created in the business world have shown us the possibilities of danger and disaster that lie in our present industrial condition. The Commission created by the President to investigate the conditions in the mining regions and to arrange a settlement of the controversy between the operators and the miners will undoubtedly give to the public a report which will have a first-rate educational value. The public is interested; the situation should be known. Undoubtedly the report will be well studied when it is presented.

It may contribute in a slight degree to that work of popular education if attention be called to the extended investigation of the mining question made by the Industrial Commission. Hence, a brief résumé of the evidence and recommendations concerning the situation in the mining industry is here presented. In addition, attention is called to the valuable report made by the Hon. Carroll D. Wright on the strike controversy, last summer, and published in the Bulletin of the Department of Labor, November, 1902.

This Industrial Commission was approved by an act of Congress of June 18, 1898, and its duty was, according to this act, "to investigate questions pertaining to immigration, to labor, to agriculture, to manufacturing and to business, and to report to Congress and to suggest such legislation as it may deem best upon these subjects. . . . It shall furnish such information and suggest such laws as may be made a basis for uniform legislation by the various states of the union, in order to harmonize conflicting interests and to be equitable to the laborer, the employer, the producer and the consumer."

Hence, we may well expect to find in the reports of the Industrial Commission much information which will be duplicated by the Anthracite Coal Commission. The testimony

regarding the conditions of capital and labor in coal mining in the eastern states was taken in 1899, and additional statements of one or two leading representatives of the employers and employees of this industry were secured in 1901. Moreover, the complaints and the demands of the miners are almost the same as they were at the time when the testimony was taken. The testimony will show that the problem, though changed in accidental features is essentially the same.

The exact words of the text are occasionally given without references or quotation marks: they may be easily traced to the original sources. The fifth, ninth, twelfth, seventeenth and nineteenth volumes of the Report of the Industrial Commission and the November number of the Bulletin of the Department of Labor are the documents chiefly employed.

THE ANTHRACITE COAL MINES OF PENNSYLVANIA.

The anthracite coal deposits of Pennsylvania are located in the northeastern part of the state, less than 150 miles from New York, and 100 miles from Philadelphia. They are scattered over four distinct areas: (1) The Northern or Wyoming field, with Carbondale, Scranton and Wilkesbarre as the principal centres; (2) the Southern or Schuylkill field lying east and west of Pottsville; (3) the Eastern Middle or Lehigh region, about Hazelton; (4) the Western Middle of Mahanoy and Shamokin basins (XIX, 444).

These deposits vary greatly in size and character—the Northern and Southern being by far the largest. In the Wyoming field the coal beds lie only 1,000 or 1,200 feet below the surface, while in the Western Middle field the depth of the mines reaches 2,000 feet. In the Southern field the general depth is still greater and for this reason it has not been developed as rapidly as the other regions. The veins are very irregular; some are worked which are only three or four feet in thickness, while elsewhere they may reach forty feet and even more, as is the case in the Mammoth beds.

These mines were discovered between 1770. and 1790 by a party of hunters, camping in the region, who were astounded at seeing the ground take fire. The “black stones” were used for many years for different purposes, as for instance in

Philadelphia for the construction of gravel walks. But it is only towards 1820 that hard coal mining began as a trade (XIX, 446).

The amount of anthracite mined yearly has not increased much for the last twenty-five years; it amounts to little over 50,000,000 long tons (2,240 pounds) while the production of bituminous coal, which was hardly larger than that of the anthracite twenty-five years ago reached 250,000,000 tons for the year 1900, and has considerably increased since then. But more perfect machinery and methods are regularly introduced in drilling, blasting, loading coal, propping mines, hauling coal from the rooms, conveying it to tipple, dumping screening, weighing. The dangers of the mining industry have been greatly reduced by improved methods in ventilation and drainage though they are still considerable.

Unfortunately, in anthracite mining, as well as in many other industries, social progress has not kept pace with the mechanical progress, and while more perfect machinery has been introduced in mining, the relations between the operators and miners have been more and more strained until they have reached the present critical state of open rupture.

The developments which have led to the present condition may be briefly told.

The railroad companies have, little by little, monopolized most of the coal mining industry of Pennsylvania (XIX, 446). At the present time they own or lease more than nine tenths of the coal deposits. However, as most railroads are not permitted by law to operate coal mines directly (447), they make use of subsidiary coal mining companies for this purpose. Thus, the Philadelphia and Reading Railroad coal is mined by the Philadelphia and Reading Coal and Iron Co., of which it owns the entire capital stock. Similarly the Central Railroad of New Jersey operates the Lehigh and Wilkesbarre Coal Co., the Pennsylvania through the Scranton Coal Co., etc.

Not only have the railroads evaded in this way the law prohibiting combined privileges of mining and transportation, but they have used this system to eliminate independent operators (448). They have charged them excessive rates for the transportation of the coal from the mines to tidewater, alleging that

they charge the same rates to their own subsidiary mining companies. The result, in fact, has been that most of these subsidiary companies have been apparently operated at a loss. But, on the other hand, it is obvious that the railroads have fully recouped themselves for these deficits by means of the corresponding profits which they have made in transportation (XIX, 453). The ultimate result has been the gradual absorption of the property of the independent operators by the railroad companies.

At the same time continual attempts on the part of the railroad companies have been made to restrict production and prescribe prices by artificial means. Agreements were made between the companies to limit the yearly output to a certain quantity determined by the extent of the mining properties of each company. Combination was attempted by means of pooling, then by lease of one railroad to another. Public opinion, official investigations, decisions of courts, enactment of laws, nothing could check the progress of combination. In fact, it has continued to our day, no longer by allotment of tonnage, pooling or lease, but by outright purchase of stock holding control.

While the operators tended more and more toward consolidation, a like movement took place among the miners. They also united, and in union they found strength comparable to that of their employers.

The first organization of coal miners in the anthracite coal region (XII, xxiv) was formed as early as 1860. Several attempts were made to establish (XII, xxiv) a national organization. They had greater or less temporary success, until the "United Mine Workers" association was formed in 1890. The great bituminous strike of 1897 gave it an extraordinary impulse. Yet, in the anthracite region, it attained considerable strength only at the time of the anthracite strike of 1900. It went into that strike with a membership of only 8,000 among the anthracite miners and came out of it with about 100,000.

It has been the continual professed aim of this organization (XVII, 190) to better the condition of the miners. Its efforts to secure proper wages (XVII, 186), paid in lawful money, to regulate the weighing of coal, to obtain and enforce legislation

on prevention of accidents in the mines, on employers' liability on accidents, on the length of the working day and on child labor have not been fruitless. They had to fight every step in their progress towards a better social condition; nevertheless much has been accomplished.

About 1875 the sliding scale system was established; the wages of the miners were to advance in proportion with the price of coal. It was then thought to be a great gain for the miners. But they soon complained that they could not verify the computations of the company on which their wages depended, and that in fact the operators had failed to raise the wages when the price of coal rose.

This was not the only grievance of the miners. When, on September 12, 1900, the strike was declared, they demanded, besides the abolition of the sliding scale system, an advance of 10 to 20 per cent. in the wages, according to the class of labor—semi-monthly payment in cash—abolishment of the system of 3,360 pounds to the ton and restoration of the 2,240 pound system—appointment of a checkweighman by the miners to verify the weight taken by the company; protection of the men in the mines—abolishment of the company store system, and company doctor system—reduction in the price of powder, from \$2.75 to \$1.50. The price of powder is an important matter as the miners buy from the operators all powder used for blasting.

The demands were not all granted. The strikers returned to work on a promise of an increase of 10 per cent. in wages. The sliding scale was abolished and the operators agreed to take up with their men any further grievances they might have. The price of powder was reduced to \$1.50 a keg, but the difference was deducted from the increase of wages.

On the whole it was a victory for the miners, and their union. Yet the war between the two great combinations (XVII, 192) did not end there. The term of the concessions granted by the operators expired April 1, 1901. As the time approached the operators posted notices to the effect that they were ready to continue the same terms until April 1, 1902. In spite of this offer it seemed for a time that a general strike would be called. The miners were clamoring for a recognition

of the Union. Finally the strike was averted. The operators held a conference with the leaders of the miners and "held out the hope that if during the present year the mine workers demonstrated their willingness and ability to abstain from engaging in local strikes, full and complete recognition of the organization would unquestionably be accorded at a future date."

The conflict averted in April, 1901, broke out in March, 1902. The miners demanded arbitration. The National Civic Federation endeavored to induce operators to arbitrate. But to no avail. The operators insisted there was nothing to arbitrate. Finally, the strike was declared, and in May, 1902, 145,000 miners went out. The strike continued until last October when the President called in conference, the representatives, operators and miners "in regard to the failure of the coal supply which had become a matter of vital concern to the whole nation." Negotiations went on until the second half of October when a commission of arbitrators, appointed by the President, was accepted by both parties.

Its purpose, according to the instructions of the President, is to endeavor to establish the relations between employers and wage workers on a just and permanent basis, and as far as possible, to do away with any causes for recurrence of such difficulties as those it is called on to settle.

The miners returned to work on the 23d of October, and the next day the Commission met in Washington to begin its proceedings.

COMPLAINTS OF MINERS. WAGES.

The first complaint of the miners at the time of the hearings of the Industrial Commission as well as now, was that they did not receive fair wages. They admitted that since 1897 wages had risen and they attributed this rise to the strength of the organization, to strikes and to the general increase in the price of labor. Yet they contended that these wages were too low, whether compared to the American standard of living or to the wages received in other occupations of the same nature.

Most of the mining done in the anthracite fields is done on a contract or piecework system. As these contracts are gen-

erally made by individual bargaining between the miner and the superintendent, and as they vary from mine to mine and from vein to vein, it is very difficult to ascertain what is the average earning of the miner. What increases the difficulty is that each miner (XII, xxv) has usually one or two assistants, whom he pays, and therefore, the amounts figured by the operators often represent not the wages of a single man, but the wages of two or three men. Another fact to be taken into consideration in the computation of wages is that coal miners are employed only a fraction of the year. Out of over 300 possible working days, the miners are employed seldom over 200 days in the year, sometimes much less. These facts will serve to explain the strange differences which exist between the testimony of the miners and that of the representatives of the companies. Some assert that the yearly wages of a miner averages from \$500 to \$1,000, while others testify that an underground miner receives less than \$2.00 a day, other laborers from \$1.10 to \$1.64; the workers on breakers \$1.00 to \$1.20. To those figures must be added the 10 per cent. increase which was the result of the anthracite strike of 1900.

According to an operator (IX, clxv) who appeared before the Industrial Commission in March, 1901, therefore after the 10 per cent. increase, the average wage of the coal miners throughout the year was \$40.00 a month. About 12 per cent. of the whole number are boys who receive half this rate. The average wages for foremen above ground are \$2.71 per day; for mechanics above ground \$1.92; for laborers above ground \$1.29; for boys under sixteen, 62 cents. Below ground, a foreman receives \$3.05 on an average; miners, \$2.40; laborers, \$1.63, and boys under sixteen 89 cents. According to this witness the average number of days worked is about 200 a year, hence, the annual wage is lower than one might think.

The Commissioner of Labor obtained about the same figures from the mine operators. The monthly earnings of miners working for the Delaware, Lackawanna and Western R. R. Co., are \$66.48. In the Reading Co., the average daily earnings during November, 1901, were from \$2.00 to \$3.00 for regular miners; \$1.20 to \$1.60 for laborers, and 85 cents for boys.

METHOD OF PAYMENT.

Formerly employers paid wages every month, always retaining half a month's earnings at the time of payment. The United Mine Workers obtained a semi-monthly payment but the employers still held back from ten days' to two weeks' wages. Weekly payment seems to be the universal desire of the employees, because provisions and supplies could be bought for cash outside of the company's stores at cheaper rates, and miners would be less under the control of the employers.

The operators complain of the great labor involved in the making out of frequent pay-rolls: they add that pay day is likely to be followed by two or three days of idleness and dissipation. But the miners see in this monthly or bimonthly payment only an attempt on the part of the operators to compel the men to trade at the company stores.

COMPANY STORES AND TENEMENTS.

The method of payment was one of the most bitter complaints of miners in the strike of 1900. Company stores and company tenements have been established in places of work remote from business centres, and if the employers were satisfied with a fair compensation for the building and running of such stores and tenements, they would be a great benefit to the employees. But this is generally not the case. In certain mining sections of Pennsylvania, the prices at company stores are said to be 25 to 40 per cent. higher than elsewhere. Moreover, company stores and tenements are objected to even where the prices are not excessive, because they limit the choice of the miners and, above all, are an instrument of oppression in the hands of the operators. According to the miners, often, men who fail to trade at the company store or to occupy the company tenement are discharged. It must be remarked, however, that this question has not had, in the last strike, the importance which it had in 1900.

CHILD LABOR.

(XII, cxlv.) The miners complain that they are often so poorly paid that they feel driven by necessity to take their

children into the mines, while the operators prefer to employ boys for certain classes of work on account of the lower pay. Yet this custom is deprecated by every one. All agree that it interferes with the physical, intellectual and moral development of the children, and the representatives of labor add that the competition of children with men lowers wages and increases the number of unemployed.

The law of Pennsylvania allows children over fourteen to be employed under ground, and those over twelve over ground. It also requires them to attend school until they are fifteen years of age.

HOURS OF WORK.

The strike of 1897 secured for the bituminous coal fields of Illinois, Indiana, Ohio and Pennsylvania the eight-hour day. But in the anthracite mines great irregularity of hours seemed to exist. The miners working by contract have their own way, yet ten hours is recognized as a full day. Miners working by the day, laborers, mechanics, etc., work ten hours.

The representatives of the miners advocate a shorter day. They declare that the change which took place in bituminous fields has been beneficial to the health of the miners and to their mental and moral culture without working injury to the operators.

The operators, in answer to this demand of the miners, say that there is already too much idleness and loafing among the men. They claim that on the average the contract miners work only five hours a day and that, moreover, there are constant interruptions of work on account of picnics, parties, excursions and celebrations of all kinds.

CONDITIONS OF WORK.

(XIX, 905.) One of the great arguments of the miners in favor of an increase of wages and a decrease of hours is the character of the coal mining industry. It is, they say, more unhealthy and more dangerous than most other occupations. The absence of light is in itself an element of injury to the health of underground workers. Still more serious is the impurity of the air, which they are constantly breathing. Ventilation is only a partial success. The dampness, or at

times, the obnoxious coal dust, the confined and strained positions in which the miner is often obliged to work, are also causes which soon tell on his physical condition.

Moreover, the mines are the scenes of innumerable accidents to the workingmen. This is still more the case in the anthracite coal mines of Pennsylvania which are deeper and more exposed to noxious gases. The veins too, are more frequently thin and tilted. The proportion of fatal accidents in the anthracite mines is in most years considerably over 3 per 1,000 persons employed while the number of injured miners is twice and often three times larger.

The most general cause of fatal accidents is the falling of coal and rock, especially from the roof of the working places. Statistics show that nearly 2,000 miners were killed by falling of coal and slate in the Pennsylvania anthracite coal mines between 1891 and 1900. Another serious cause of accidents is connected with mine cars. The slopes and underground roads in which these cars are run are often so narrow that except where safety holes have been provided no person can pass the moving and loaded cars. About one-tenth of the fatalities is caused by explosions of gas or firedamp. Such explosions can often be traced to the lack of proper ventilation or of proper inspection of the mines by foremen and "fire bosses." A very large proportion of accidents in the anthracite mines is also due to blasting, though it must be added, the miner's carelessness is very frequently the cause.

(XII, xxvi.) There is considerable friction between miners and operators in regards to docking for impurities in coal. The operators contend that the practice is necessary to prevent some miners from careless work. The miners allege that whole cars are deducted from their account because of trifling amounts of slate or dirt. They have demanded judges of docking, but the requests have been refused.

The miners have been allowed to have their own check weighmen. Some complain that these check weighmen are not permitted to test the scales as often as they see fit, or that the cars are sometimes measured instead of weighed, or that, where they are paid by the car, the size of the cars has been increased without a corresponding increase of the pay.

Hence, their demand now is that they shall be paid by weight and that 2,240 pounds shall constitute the ton.

LABOR ORGANIZATION.

One of the most important causes of conflict between miners and operators in the anthracite coal fields is the obstinacy of the latter in refusing a formal recognition of the organization called the "United Mine Workers." This question has come more and more to the front with the rapid development of the union.

The trade unions have been recognized in many great industries. In this case, the representatives of the unions deal directly with representatives of the corporations, and fix the wage scale and the conditions of labor (XIX). To cite only one or two examples which have come more prominently before the eyes of the public, the managers of the steel combinations which now make up the "United States Steel Corporation" deal with the officers of the Amalgamated Association of Iron, Steel and Tin workers, and even sign the scale with them (XII, xxx). Another example which is still more to the point is that of the joint conferences between miners and operators in the bituminous coal industry. The interstate convention representing the operators and miners of Western Pennsylvania, Ohio, Indiana and Illinois, determines the wages, houses and other conditions of labor for the ensuing year. Besides interstate conventions, there are state conferences in which lesser disputes are settled between the operators' commissioners and the miners' officials. The commissioner of the Illinois Coal Operators' Association states that he acted in about 200 cases within a year—in joint conferences with the representatives of the miners and in every instance they came to an amicable settlement.

During the strike of 1900, the anthracite coal miners endeavored in vain to obtain the official recognition of the union. They have renewed their efforts during the last two years and in the last general strike it has become one of the main demands of the miners.

(XII, 113.) The fundamental reason of this opposition lies in the desire of the employers to secure labor as cheaply

as possible. There is no doubt that this end is obtained more easily by dealing individually with employers than by dealing with the officials of the union.

Other reasons are alleged by the operators, the one most frequently appealed to, being the irresponsibility of the union. The organization, they say, contains in the anthracite coal fields of Pennsylvania, a strong element of lawlessness and violence. There has been more trouble with the discipline since 1900, *i. e.*, since the development of the union, than ever before. The leaders are often thrown into their positions by an ignorant vote, they are without the necessary requirements. If they are fit for the charge they are frequently forced into courses of action which they do not approve, as was the case when the last strike was declared (Dep. of Lab. Bulletin, November 1902, p. 1149). The union, conscious of its irresponsibility, has constantly refused to incorporate.

(XII, cxlvii, XIX, 967.) They admit that the recognition of the union by the bituminous coal operators has brought about beneficial results, but entirely different conditions prevail in the anthracite coal fields. There the foreign element predominates, a class of people entirely unfamiliar with the traditions and customs of organization, unaccustomed to the rules and self-control which it imposes, liable to misunderstand the purpose and institutions of a labor union.

In fact, a large number of the miners, which some estimate as high as 60 per cent., belongs to the non-English speaking races and many of them are still unable to speak English. These foreigners, mostly Poles, Slavs, Lithuanians, Hungarians and Italians, are largely without education, unmarried, and live in a manner which would never be acceptable to Americans. It will require a long time to train such a class of men into American methods and customs, and to develop in them the spirit of our labor organizations.

BLACKLISTING.

No convincing proof has been given of blacklisting. Yet it is a general feeling among the miners that they are refused work on account of affiliation to the union, or of the active part they have taken in organizing labor. It is true, the

employees have a counter weapon in the boycott, though the latter has never proved very useful to the anthracite miners. The blacklist, they say, has been very injurious to them. Yet, it is very hard to detect the truth in this connection, as the men are too apt to exaggerate the wrongs of the operators and they too often see an injustice in the mere attempt to maintain order and discipline.

REMEDIES.

It was the purpose of the Industrial Commission to suggest remedies for the present industrial evils. Hence one turns with interest to see what may be the recommendations of the Commission. To quote the words of the Report: (XIX, 933.) "The Industrial Commission has recognized the very general feeling on the part of the people that strikes and lockouts are in many instances, unduly expensive methods of settling differences, and that they, too, frequently injure greatly the welfare of large bodies of the people as well as that of the parties in dispute. The Commission has, therefore, investigated very thoroughly the methods employed for promoting industrial peace, both in the United States and in foreign countries, and has considered various proposals for the extension of these methods either by legislation or by voluntary action of organizations of employers and employees."

Three processes by which disputes may be adjusted are treated at length in the Report of the Industrial Commission; they are: collective bargaining, conciliation and arbitration.

The first two processes have already been referred to and are, to a certain extent, practiced in the bituminous coal regions of the United States.

Collective bargaining consists in an agreement between the employers and organized workingmen to fix the general conditions of labor. It is also called by the name of joint conferences, wageboards, agreement system. To be successful it must be conducted by and between organizations of fair-minded working people having honest, intelligent, and conservative leaders, and employers who are also honest, conservative and fair-minded (XIX, 839). Collective bargaining, though adopted by ten or twelve leading trades in the United States, has not yet been worked into its ultimate form.

The Commission suggests that this practice be extended

to industries and developed where it is already established. It is of opinion that the joint conference should be composed of relatively large numbers of representatives of employers and employees, so as to render the committees of the two parties as thoroughly representative as possible. These conferences may be held at fixed intervals, or when a change in the conditions of labor takes place, but always on the principle of friendly negotiation rather than formal rules and fixed procedure. It is also thought more advantageous that the conditions of labor be determined not by vote, but rather by peaceful discussions and mutual concessions, leading to practical unanimity.

(XIX, 835.) *Conciliation* is the process by which lesser disputes concerning matters of interpretation are settled, either through direct negotiations between the employers and employees concerned or through the action of joint boards representing the organizations to which they belong.

Arbitration, according to the Commission, should not be resorted to unless all means of bargaining and conciliation have been exhausted. Arbitration means an authoritative decision by some person or persons not directly concerned. The Commission discountenances the practice of submitting important questions regarding the general conditions of labor to outside arbitrators. It is urged that "no person outside the trade has the necessary technical knowledge on which to base a reasonable decision." They cannot understand sufficiently the relative strength of the employers and the employees, the conditions of competition within the trade and of competition from other sections and other countries. They are "too often inclined to split the difference in the matter of wages, whereas a just decision would rather, in many cases, be strictly in favor of the position taken by the one side or the other." Finally, they are not likely to overcome wholly certain inherent prejudices, the outcome of their training and environment.

The application of these suggestions to the present anthracite coal conditions is obvious to all. Arbitration has been resorted to after the failure of all other means. An attempt was made during the proceedings to return to the regular process of bargaining between employers and employees, but it failed.

There is no doubt that the majority of the members of the

Industrial Commission favored not only the formation of labor organizations, but also their recognition by employers. It suggests the solution of labor questions through collective bargaining. But collective bargaining as defined by the Commission is: "The process by which the general labor contract itself is agreed upon by negotiation directly between employers, or employers' associations and organized workingmen. Yet these organizations of workingmen should be composed of fair-minded working people, having honest, intelligent and conservative leaders." This suggestion will help us to understand the stubborn effort of the operators, during the hearings of the Coal Commission to show that the United Mine Workers are an irresponsible, lawless, dissolute, violent crowd. It is to be feared by the friends of organized labor that some truth will be found in the charge.

Besides the recommendation by the Industrial Commission of voluntary action of employers and employees, it also suggests such legislation on hours of work, method of payment, discrimination, etc., as may again throw light on the present anthracite problems.

(XIX, 948.) The Commission proposed as a model of legislation, for all states, the provisions of the Utah constitutions and statutes by which the time of employment in all underground mines and workings, shall be eight hours a day, except in cases of emergency, when life or property is in imminent danger.

(XIX, 949.) A law regulating the payment of wages should be adopted by all states, providing that laborers "shall be paid, for all labor performed, in cash or cash orders, without discount, not in goods or in due bills, and that no compulsion, direct or indirect, should be used to make them purchase supplies at any particular store." Mining employers should not be permitted to run supply stores at all. They have often evaded the laws by exacting a percentage on all purchases from a supposed independent store.

Provisions for the fair weighing of coal at mines before passing over a screen or other device, in order that the miner may be compensated for all coal having a market value, should be adopted.

The Commission recommends laws against discrimination

and blacklisting. Employers may be allowed to communicate to one another fair information upon subjects of mutual interest, but at the same time, no man must be excluded from employment because he belongs or does not belong to a union.

As regards safety in mines, as well as in other industries, the Commission requires as a matter of primary importance, not only compensation to the workingmen after the occurrence of accidents, but still more, preventative methods and legislation providing for them. The sanitary conditions of the mines must also be improved to protect, as far as possible, the health of the underground workers. Means of drainage, and more particularly of ventilation should be provided in more liberal manner than would be necessary merely to make work possible and safe (XIX, 910).

Mine inspection should be regulated very carefully. The laws of Pennsylvania, are, it is true, proposed by the Commission as a model of legislation for other states, but at the same time it is asserted that in this state the number of inspectors is often insufficient, nor are they always thoroughly competent.

The suggestions of the Commissioner of Labor, practically confirms those of the Industrial Commission, the only new feature being that in insisting on the advantages and importance of collective bargaining and conciliation, he advocates the organization of an anthracite coal miners' union independent of the United Mine Workers. The report is very carefully done; hence it is not to be expected that the finding of the Strike Commission will vary in many essentials from it.

Crises such as the Pullman strike in Chicago and the recent anthracite strike show very clearly that our institutions fail to meet the modern situation in industry. While such troubles are greatly to be regretted, they at least force advance in our social education, awaken the public and prepare the way for industrial peace.¹

LEO DUBOIS.

THE MARIST COLLEGE,
WASHINGTON, D. C.

¹ Since this résumé was prepared, the Commission appointed by the President has made its recommendations. The chief features are: ten per cent. increase in wages; a nine-hour day; arbitration to decide on all questions concerning the awards; a sliding scale; no discrimination against union or non-union labor; the award to continue in force until March 31, 1906.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Jean-Marie de La Mennais (1780-1860). Par le R. P. Laveille, prêtre de l'Oratoire. Paris: Poussielgue, 1903. 2 vols., 8°, pp. xli + 550, 679. 11 francs.

This life of the brother of the unhappy Félicité de La Mennais comes opportunely at the end of a long series of contributions to the tragic history of the founder of modern Christian apologetics. For some years, mémoires, letters, documents, have been multiplying, as the result of the gradual dispersion of the literary effects of the generation that lived so long under the spell of the Sage of la Chesnaie. The Lamennaisian literature is now a very extensive one; if it has not changed the traditional views of the events and measures that culminated in the philosopher's apostasy, it has brought light into many dark corners, and furnished rich material for the future historian of the vicissitudes of Catholic theology and its immediately correlated or ancillary sciences. Nearly thirteen hundred pages are devoted by Fr. Laveille to the story of Jean-Marie de La Mennais, the brother of "Féli," with whom he shared his heart, his mind, his ideals and aspirations, his plans and methods, until the crushing events of one fatal year (1832-1833), put a gulf between himself and the apostate, and opened for both of these remarkable priests a "via dolorosa" that has made forever memorable the name of a remote dairy-farm in the loneliest depths of Brittany.

If the career of Félicité de La Mennais ended in spiritual and intellectual disasters worthy of the pen of a Dante, that of his brother Jean-Marie led onward and upward, by a royal Via Crucis, to the heights of sanctity. Since 1901, the question of his canonization is an open one at Rome. This son of a merchant of Saint-Malo possessed in the highest degree certain apostolic virtues, among them a consuming energy and an evenly burning enthusiasm. His first, and he had hoped his most effective conquest, was his own brother: a doubt will always reign in the minds of many whether the latter had a vocation to the work of a priest, and whether Jean-Marie were wise in compelling that fiery soul to enter the sanctuary. Jean-Marie was for much in his brother's most famous writings; he was cofounder of la Chesnaie, and equally active in the organization of Catholic public opinion, and the creation of anti-Gallican and pro-Roman policies, measures, and institutions. To both the French

Erastianism of their day was equally odious. A profound study of the mediæval world had persuaded both that genuine political liberty for Frenchmen was impossible apart from the closest union with the See of Rome. *Papa et populus*: that bold cry of Gregory VII. to the people of Milan, seemed to both these men even yet big with possibilities of peace and justice. Félicité forgot that the first virtue of a soldier was obedience, his first conquest submission of himself. Democracy was then far from the solidity of its modern *assiette*, an object of suspicion and hatred to a multitude of faithful Catholics—especially in Brittany—who had lost their all to its stormy apostles. The chanceries and bureaucracies of continental Europe had their faces turned toward the past rather than the future, and were busy in restoration rather than in transformation. The Fabian policy of the Holy See was a stone of scandal for the younger de La Mennais. Had he possessed more Christian patience, more insight and sympathy for the difficult circumstances of the papacy; above all, had he followed the friendly solicitations of Bishop Bruté, and buried himself for a time in the solitudes of the New World, his fate would have probably been another and a happier one.

The story of Jean-Marie is that of an educator—first in colleges and seminaries, which he founded or restored within the limits of his native Brittany, then in the famous hermitage of la Chesnaie, where passed the flower of the French stylists of the nineteenth century, later in the novitiate of his unfortunate Congrégation de St. Pierre, that charming Malestroit, where he gathered about him such men as Gerbet, later bishop of Perpignan, de Herecé, bishop of Nancy, the abbé Blanc, and the abbé Rohrbacher, church historians of note. The education of the clergy, the training of a multitude of Frenchmen to announce the truths of Catholicism in the polished accents of Bossuet and Fénelon, was the original pre-occupation of Jean-Marie de La Mennais. Both brothers were profoundly convinced that the man of France must be dealt with intellectually, on the highest level of speech. There is something of Brahmanic fixity in the Gallic adoration of “la parole”—hence, the insufferably pedantic Boileau can hold forever an open shrine and find a whole nation of cryptic votaries of his “art de bien dire.” Félicité de La Mennais was pleased when he had finished ten lines in a whole day; all the strength of this physically unseemly man lay in

lo bello stile che m’ha fatto onore.

Not even a De Maistre and a Châteaubriand have reached that compelling beauty of form that ravishes every reader of “Les Affaires

de Rome'' and ''Les Paroles d'un Croyant.'' He may be a lonely and blasted peak, seamed by the devastating bolts of heaven, but his seared head is also crowned with eternal snows that forever beckon and impress and fascinate, only to fill the oncomer with awe and horror as he realizes out of what depths of moral ruin rises this Titanic wreck, this Prometheus of ineffable pride and unfathomable suffering.

The durable work of Jean-Marie de La Mennais consists in two Breton teaching congregations for the children of the poor, the Brothers of Christian Instruction of Plöermel, and the Sisters of Providence of Saint Brienc. The former have overrun all Brittany, and are busy with their calling throughout the French colonial possessions; an attempt to establish them in England failed. He labored likewise by advice and help to strengthen the teaching communities of many French dioceses. These incessant labors, as well as endless conflicts with a jealous government, eventually affected his health. Yet he toiled on to the end, courageous, unselfish, far-seeing—it would seem as if he felt himself somehow bound to uplift the name of La Mennais and compensate the Church for the losses occasioned by the spiritual bankruptcy of his brother. The most touching chapters of the work are those devoted to the relations between the two men, relations that grew weaker after 1833 and eventually ceased, not without causing great suffering to the innocent party. This life of one of the earliest and foremost apostles of Catholic education is worthy to rank with the best of those lives of French public men of the nineteenth century that have lately been printed—Louis Veuillot, Montalembert, Dupanloup, and others. In many ways it is a melancholic book. And yet it is inspiring, for it shows a brave and honest soul in daily conflict with opposition, interference and persecution, bearing steadily an intimate domestic cross, and expending an incredible energy on a multitude of enterprises for God's glory, any one of which would have exhausted the zeal of an ordinary Christian.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Summa Theologica V. Tractatus de Deo-Homine sive de Verbo Incarnato. Auctore Laurentio Janssens, O.S.B., S.T.D. II Pars. Mariologia et Soteriologia. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. xxxiv + 1021. \$4.25 net.

The simple order of facts narrated in the scriptures furnished Saint Thomas with a plan of treatment for soteriology. The author of this volume finds the plan of Saint Thomas so admirably suited

to present needs that he contents himself with merely adding to the text and its exposition such positive and critical information as the times demand. His method of presentation is, therefore, essentially scholastic. Many curious queries that might without loss have been omitted as so much that was "*nimis subtiliter investigatum*" receive their share of attention in the subject-matter treated. The historical method of meeting objections directly, and not laterally as so many side-issues, is a distinct feature of modern treatises, although hard to apply in a commentary whose very nature perhaps makes its absence excusable. The positive studies scattered through this volume in the form of appendices, the extensive bibliography, marginal references and quotations, as well as the excellent analytical index which it contains, are especially noteworthy. To all these newer features may be added a gracious Latin style and the attraction of a well-bound and clearly printed book.

More than five hundred pages of this work are devoted to questions concerning the Blessed Virgin. The author portrays the Old Testament types of the Virgin Mother, analyzes the dogmatic definition of the Immaculate Conception, sees in Genesis a direct source of the doctrine, finds accommodated sources in Ecclesiasticus, Proverbs, the Canticle of Canticles, and rehearses at length the argument from tradition. He pays little attention to the criticisms that have been advanced against the first source, and is inclined to regard the Proto-Evangelium as a genuine reference to the doctrine in question. From certain expressions, here and there, it would seem that the author takes rather too realistic a view of the wounding of nature by original sin. But this impression may be only subjective on the reader's part, as the author has not yet had occasion to treat of this matter professedly.

He recognizes and proves the opposition made to the doctrine of the Immaculate Conception by the Lombard, St. Anselm, St. Bernard, Hugo of St. Victor, St. Thomas, and St. Bonaventure, though he very justly remarks that the latter finally overcame his negative attitude. *Scotus* was the mediæval champion of the Mother conceived without stain, and his view was destined eventually to triumph. The author endeavors to explain the hostility of these theologians, and especially Saint Thomas. The latter, according to Dr. Janssens, failed to grasp the idea of redemption by anticipation. It was this oversight on the part of St. Thomas, which led him to argue from the singular privilege of Christ to a denial of the Immaculate Conception. Sin was universal; so was the need of redemption in all individuals descended from Adam in a natural way. According to

the universal laws of contracted sin and the need of redemption, the Virgin Mother had to be redeemed and therefore must in some way have contracted the original stain. Now it is without question that the Blessed Virgin was individually included in the economy of the redemption; the Immaculate Conception was not an isolated fact, but one related to the redemptive work of Christ, whose meritorious effects were, by a special privilege, applied to her by anticipation. St. Thomas was, therefore, right in his general principle, but wrong in his particular instance. He simply failed to see that actual contraction of original sin was not necessary for actual redemption.

This interpretation of St. Thomas is not general, and much could be said in favor of a far different reading of the texts. It is well supported, however, by the author who is fully aware that he is only stating the results of his own personal study and not settling a moot point between rival interpreters.

The author reviews the many plausible interpretations of the name "Mary" that have been suggested by scholars ancient and modern; states the controversial literature on the authorship of the Magnificat which he holds should be ascribed to the Blessed Virgin and not to her cousin Elizabeth; and criticizes the arguments against the perpetual virginity of Mary drawn from certain texts of the Gospel, her marriage with St. Joseph, and the occasional mention of the Lord's brethren made by the Evangelists. In a final appendix, after rehearsing the tradition and reviewing the theological arguments in favor of the Assumption, the author is of opinion that this doctrine may be made a matter of dogmatic definition. The dissertation on the Immaculate Conception is the most widely developed topic treated in the first part of this book.

The Soteriology, properly so-called, comprises, besides the regular questions treated by St. Thomas, several instructive dissertations on the names of Christ, devotion to the Sacred Heart, the Precious Blood, and the Wounds of the Redeemer. In discussing the problem of reconciling Christ's free oblation of himself with the command received from the Father to die for men, the author endeavors to reach a middle ground between rival views. He admits that the command partook of the nature of a strict precept, but denies that it was explicit; the very idea of the sacrificial character of Christ's mission contained it implicitly as part of Christ's destination, and so the Sinless One could neither refuse nor fail to observe it. Yet in its actual observance, so the author contends, Christ truly merited because of the perfect love with which he accepted and fulfilled the command of the Father. This is certainly a suggestive solution of

a problem that is overrun with a veritable network of inventions and subtleties. It may leave much to be desired, but it destroys no facts, and appeals to no fictions.

We miss in the Soteriology the fuller positive treatment lavished upon the first part of the volume. The question of the atonement of Christ has only the mediæval background to give it setting, and lacks the robust character of the questions discussed in the Mariology. But we must remember that Dr. Jannsens is writing a commentary on the Summa, and endeavoring to present St. Thomas to modern students. That he has succeeded in giving us something far above the average commentary in matter, style, bibliography, and positive information, none will deny, not even those who do not share all his views, nor regard the commentary as an ideal form of exposition.

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

Sul Motivo Primario della Incarnazione del Verbo. P. Francesco M. Risi, dell'ordine di San Giovanni di Dio. 4 vols., 8°. Rome: Desclée, Lefèbvre, e Comp., 1898.

The first volume of this work contains an historical survey of the speculations concerning the primary motive of the Incarnation, together with a criticism of the various views and the arguments on which these are made to rest. The first to raise the question explicitly whether Christ's coming was solely on account of sin or for a larger purpose, in which sin figured only as a secondary and modifying feature, was Rupert, Abbot of Duitz, in the twelfth century. Thenceforward to our own day the question has been much agitated within and without the pale of the Church Catholic. The author discusses the growing persuasion, in the minds of many writers, of the truth and beauty of the Scotist world-view, and loses no occasion to extol its excellence and grandeur. The method of presentation throughout is scholastic and frequently polemical, although historical considerations abound. We cannot follow Father Risi into the labyrinthian detail of his exposition, nor should we agree with all his contentions if we did. Suffice it to say that the author does not make the view which he holds any more acceptable by defending certain vague metaphysical generalities as persuasive thereunto. The view itself, is worth more than many of the refinements of thought invented for its support. These considerations apart, the first volume gives a very full, if not prolix, presentation to a speculative opinion which is usually, and unjustly, dismissed, in most text-books, with only a passing mention, or refuted with a stereotyped syllogism.

The second volume is devoted to the presentation of what St. Thomas thought on the question. The author collects the scattered texts, re-enforces them with his own commentary, but sometimes, we fear, lets his wish play father to his thought in reading their meaning. When we build syllogistic bridges to another's meaning, we may be right, and we may be wrong, too, if we attempt to cross them. We are glad, however, to see a fuller presentation of St. Thomas than has thus far been given, and the author has surely sought out every text that would count in the reckoning.

The third volume contains an exhaustive account of the Catholic tradition on the question and is an interesting positive study. The fourth volume develops the Scriptural sources which may be said to warrant the inference that Christ was destined to be part of the perfection of the Universe even if the race had not fallen, and the redemptive character of Christ's work become paramount in the eyes of sinful men. In the fourth volume is also to be found an index of authors, sources and topics, that is very useful, together with an appendix in which the author takes exception to certain views on the name of Christ and the meaning of His eternal priesthood, attributed by Toutté to St. Cyril of Jerusalem. The patronage of Holy Writ, claimed by the author, for the Scotist view is more clearly contained in certain passages of the New Testament than in any of the Old. Despite all the author's arguments, however, it may well be doubted if we are not embarking upon too large an enterprise when we seek a philosophic point of view in Old Testament sources which have to be raised by argument to a high degree of significance before yielding the desired result.

The author deserves credit for his laborious task; only a good supply of enthusiasm would have carried him through this investigation, and he has succeeded in gathering together much positive information from the texts of the Fathers. Whatever may be thought of the scriptural and patristic value of the idea which he seeks to expose and defend, there can be little doubt of its worth and significance to contemporaneous opinion. Catholic as well as Protestant theologians are beginning to devote attention to it. Illingworth finds in the Scotist world-view, so large a spiritual outlook upon history that a nobler idea of man's unity and dignity must perforce come to him who sees in Christ the first-born of the brethren, whose death and suffering were an afterthought, but whose coming in the flesh was part of the world's order as planned in the divine counsels. And, indeed, if we take the trouble to reflect on the undue prominences which Protestants gave in Reformation days to the atone-

ment, with their legalistic fictions of substitution and imputation, we will readily appreciate the avidity with which they are now turning to the Incarnation as the central fact of Christianity. Christ's life-work cannot be adequately expressed in the sole idea of satisfaction. Love, mercy, and order, as well as justice, are revealed in the coming of Him who was the Head of the race no less than the Savior of men.

There are some who will think that a work like this is a threshing over of old straw, a repetition of the duel between St. Thomas and Scotus. There are others who will say, that it is a theme more vast than they have strength of pinion to carry. But both forget that we live in an age of hypothesis, and that a sweeping view, such as the one the author advocates, and for which he seeks a solid ground in tradition, may have a new significance and value quite independent of the old-style fencing of dialecticians for and against it. We would scarcely take a man seriously if he thought modern Chemistry a return to Democritus because it follows the atomic theory as a convenient working-hypothesis. Neither should we be hasty to question the wisdom of those apologists who by means of a pure hypothesis, if you will, deprive many a well-directed modern shaft of its barb and point. Balfour and Fairbairn have, as a result of historical and critical study come to the conclusion that the Incarnation is in itself so wonderful a fact that it counterbalances completely the objection drawn from the relative unimportance of man with respect to the immeasurable grandeur of the material universe. And if some men historically, and others speculatively, are working toward the same result—the central position of the God-Man in the world's history—why should we think it labor lost when extremes meet, when the old methods and the new are but different avenues leading to the same conclusion?

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

Les Galla : Un Peuple antique au pays de Ménélík. Par le R. P. Martial de Salviac, O.M.C., 2d ed. Paris: H. Oudin, 1902. Illustrated. 8°, pp. 353.

If the best books of travel and exploration in English are those of merchants and diplomats, the best in French are surely those written by the missionaries. From the days of the "Lettres Edifiantes" the French priest possesses a peculiar skill in combining with the story of his religious labors a multitude of observations and judgments, both interesting and valuable, on the public and private life of the strange peoples among whom he has taken up his abode.

For thirty-five years the late Cardinal Guglielmo Massaia had worked in Abyssinia as a Capuchin missionary, among the warlike tribes of the Galla or Oromo, whose ten million souls now form the backbone of that ancient empire, as lately compacted and rounded out by the great African statesman, the Emperor Menelik. The Letters and Memoirs of Cardinal Massaia are themselves a splendid chapter in the history of Catholic missions. But there was something to be gleaned even after him, and the pages of P. de Salviac will well repay any reader anxious to know what manner of men the modern Catholic missionaries of Abyssinian Africa are like. This charming volume introduces us to an almost absolutely unknown African people of superior worth, physically, religiously, and perhaps ethnologically. There is a tradition that the Galla are of Gaulish stock, the descendants of mercenaries of Gaul in the service of Carthage or Egypt, or of traders from the Mediterranean seaboard of continental Keltom. It is a fascinating thesis, and the arguments for it are persuasively put by Fr. de Salviac. The latter is an enthusiast, after the fashion of missionaries, for his chosen people. We must admit, however, that his text breathes sincerity and truth; also that the numerous illustrations bear out his contention that in the Galla tribes is to be found the proper native human element for the civilization of inner Africa, as far as it can be conducted from the tablelands of Abyssinia.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Documents Relatifs aux Rapports du Clergé avec la Royauté (1682-1705; 1705-1789). Publiés par Léon Mention. Paris: Picard, 1903. 8°, pp. 183.

These two latest volumes of the "Collection de Textes" are of signal utility to the students of Church history. In them are to be found many original documents of the principal controversies between France and Rome in the latter part of the seventeenth and the greater part of the eighteenth century. These documents illustrate the Liberties of the Gallican Church, the Royal Franchises at Rome, the controversies on Ecclesiastical Jurisdiction, the Maxims of the Saints, the Bulls *Vineam Domini* and *Unigenitus*, the Parliament and the Jansenists, the clerical estates, the suppression of the Jesuits. The teacher and the student of ecclesiastical history will find here highly interesting material, that otherwise they must look for in rare and often inaccessible books. Year by year the "Collection de Textes" grows in serviceableness, and now deserves a place in every library of history that contemplates personal investigation.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

St. Alphonse de Liguori (1696-1787). Par le Baron J. Angot des Rotours. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 8°, pp. xviii + 182.

The Life of Saint Philip Neri (1515-1595), Apostle of Rome and Founder of the Congregation of the Oratory, from the Italian of Father Bacci, new and revised edition. By Frederick Ignatius Antrobus of the London Oratory. St. Louis: Herder, 1903. 2 vols., 8°, pp. 392, 447. \$3.75.

1. The story of Saint Alphonsus is, in its own way, the story of the religious life of Italy in the eighteenth century, likewise one of the most remarkable chapters in the long and tortuous history of Jansenism. Quite lately, in several European centres, his writings have been assailed with great bitterness and greater injustice—an extreme anti-Catholicism has seized upon his fundamental doctrine of probabilism, in order to make political capital out of misrepresentations of the same. This brief life in the collection of “*Les Saints*” is therefore very timely. It does not pretend to the fulness of detail of a Tannoia or of Fr. Berthe (Paris, 2 vols., 1900), yet it is suggestive and instinctive; if read with the “*Letters*” of the Saint, now accessible in French and English translations, it will suffice to bring before us in vivid outline, the figure of the man who found for the troubled consciences of great multitudes formulæ that were at once consoling and enlightening, without offending truth and justice, the man to whom are owing in great measure the popular Catholic forms of spiritual revival, together with similarly popular devotions and pious practices,—Italian and “*Meridional*” in their origin and form, it may be, yet attractive and puissant enough to secure adoption among Catholics of every other land, and to lend new color and variety to the immemorial liturgical life of the Church.

2. Shortly after the death of Saint Philip (1595), his disciple Gallonio produced in Latin (1600) an annalistic life of the saint. During the next hundred years his story was told more than twenty times in Italian prose, not to speak of three metrical lives and several in foreign languages. The most important of these lives was that of Father Bacci (1646), often re-edited, in 1670 by the Dominican Ricci, and in 1794 by a Venetian Oratorian. This life was (partially) published in English in 1847, and again in 1868. The lives by Bayle (1859), by Mrs. Hope (about 1868) and the brilliant narrative of Cardinal Capecepatro (1879) translated into English (1882), do not seem to have stilled the desire of English readers. Hence, Fr. Antrobus presents us with this new edition of Bacci, a work that has always been held remarkable for simplicity, historical dignity, and

straightforwardness. It contains in full the miracles of Saint Philip, that are especially interesting to the historian of life and manners in the Italy of that day. There are also (26) letters of Saint Philip, among them two or three of some length, written to his niece, a Florentine nun. They are characteristic of the saint and of the literary taste of his day. Some of them were first published by Biscioni in 1743, in his "Raccolta di Lettere di Santi e Beati Fiorentini"; a few of them would have appealed to von Reumont for a place in his admirable "Briefe gottesfürchtiger Italiener," so quaint and peculiar is their expression of the religious sentiment. These two volumes are worthy of a place in every ecclesiastical library, as the final English presentation of the classical life by Bacci, which was itself written out of the materials for the canonization process.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Christus und Apostelbilder: Einfluss der apokryphen auf die ältesten Kunsttypen. Von J. E. Weis-Liebersdorf, with 54 illustrations. Freiburg: Herder, 1902. 8°, pp. ix + 124. \$1.50.

This conscientious study of all the oldest pictorial representations of Christ and the apostles is based upon a thorough knowledge of the actual monuments, and a close acquaintance with the modern literature that has grown out of their study. It is well known that the Gnostic literature of the second and third centuries offers frequently portraiture descriptions of Christ and the apostles, particularly of Saints Peter and Paul. Our Lord is always presented as a beardless, youthful, even child-like figure of great beauty,—from the latter half of the fourth century the figure of Christ on the sarcophagi, gilded glasses, catacomb frescoes and church mosaics, is that of a grave, bearded, majestic figure, with parted hair that flows down equally on both sides. It is also well known that all the orthodox Christian literature previous to Constantine insists on the absence of manly beauty and charm in Our Lord—His beauty was all moral and spiritual. When now the fairly numerous orthodox Christian monuments before Constantine depict Christ as a beardless youth, of genuine Hellenic beauty, it seems to be the result of Gnostic influences working through their apocryphal literature, or through Catholic adaptations and imitations of the same. Dr. Weis-Liebersdorf's book is full of the views and hypotheses of the latest students of the primitive Christian art-monuments that offer us figures or busts of Christ and the apostles. Notably new is the redating of the sarcophagus of Junius Bassus, whereby that admirable piece of Christian sculpture belongs not to the year 359, but a century earlier.

Good use is made of the latest reproduction of these sculptures by Mgr. de Waal. In general, an earlier date is asserted, and with good arguments, for several ancient Christian monuments. In spite of the grave authority of Furtwangler, our author maintains, ingeniously and successfully, the traditional antiquity of the Vatican medallion of Saints Peter and Paul. The Berlin ivory pyxis, the Milan silver casket found in 1894, the Stryzowski sarcophagus-fragment at Berlin, the Cecil Torr gilded-glass fragments, and other rare monuments, are described at length. The notes offer a valuable up-to-date bibliography, and give the book a distinctive value. This book is one result of the teaching of the Catholic faculty of theology at Munich; it acknowledges, in particular, the inspiration and guidance of the distinguished professors of Church History and Patrology in that university.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Julien l'Apostat. Par Paul Allard. Vols. II-III. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 8°, pp. 376, 416.

In the second volume of his life of Julian the Apostate M. Allard describes his career as pagan emperor, restorer of the old "cultus deorum," and convinced worshipper of the invincible Sun. The personal theology of Julian, his inimical attitude toward the "Galilæans" his attempts to debar them from the schools and to reduce them to intellectual helplessness, are treated with all the competency that the severest critics acknowledge in M. Allard. In the new volume he deals with the sojourn of Julian in Antioch, now an overwhelmingly Christian city, consequently contemptuous of the former "Reader" in its Church. The conflagration of the temple of Daphne, and the vengeance of Julian, his book "Against the Christians," and his attempt to rebuild the Temple of Jerusalem, round out the short-lived reign of the emperor that closes with the disasters of the Persian campaign and the death of the last member of that Flavian house which for nearly a century had exercised an ever-widening influence on the imperial world. Perhaps the most instructive pages of the work are the last sixty in which are enumerated and discussed the authorities, pagan and Christian, for the life of Julian.

For many years M. Allard has dealt at first hand with the texts, monuments, inscriptions, and literary remains of the imperial period, notably the third and fourth centuries. He is eminently qualified, by many learned volumes and articles, to deal with those two brief years of the sixth decade of the fourth century when the spiritual welfare of humanity truly hung trembling in the balance. All told, the line of progress was through Christianity, the line of retrogres-

sion was through the exhausted institutions of polytheism. Julian himself was obliged to confess that, without borrowing from the hated Galilæans, he could not revive the fortunes of Ethnicism or "Hellenism," as he was fond of calling it. It will always be a significant proof of the depth of the Christian transformation of imperial society that with the passing of Julian, life at once took on its former Christian character, while only here and there an impotent philosopher murmured in the accents of Plato against the decrees of an irresistible fate. The revolution of Julian was not based on popular convictions or sympathies, but on the academic pagan mysticism of a coterie of dreamers, at once doctrinaire and unreal. The sober tolerance of Jovian and Valentinian is another index that the temperament of the army and the civil service was henceforth Christian—measures of repression were not needed, at least in the Orient. Many great families in the Eternal City remained pagan yet, and a generation must elapse before the defeat of Eugenius and the Sack of Rome set a final seal on the collapse of the old Roman religion. In the meantime, the Theodosian legislation could consummate the work begun by the laws of Constantine against the worship of the gods. Like a new and heady wine, the triumphant religion penetrated in every direction the body politic and social, roused and urged, stimulated and inspired, until all memories of the Julian reaction were forgotten, only to reappear as a rallying banner when Christianity once more found itself in a parlous state not dissimilar to that which obtained under Julian, and which public opinion not unjustly crystallized in the famous contemporary legend that represents Julian transfixed by an arrow and scattering heavenward the blood from his gushing wound, with the despairing cry: "Galilæe, vicisti!"

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Un Pape Français: Urbain II (1088-1099). Par Lucien Paulot, de l'Oratoire de S. Philippe de Néri. Préface de Georges Goyau. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 8°, pp. xxxvi + 562.

The Cardinal Odo de Lageri, of Châtillon-sur-Marne, was one of the chosen lieutenants of Gregory VII in the latter's warfare against the simony and concubinage of the clergy and the abuse of investitures by the civil power. When he took up, a few years later, the work that had fallen from the hands of his mighty predecessor, he brought to the task a choice experience gathered in court, curia, and monastery, for he had been a monk at Cluny, and legate of the Holy See, as well as an intimate personal friend of Gregory VII. Henry IV and his antipope, Wibert of Ravenna, disputed with him the

possession of the Eternal City, and kept him a wanderer in Southern Italy during the early part of his reign. Here the sympathies of the Norman over-lords and the piety of the monks of Cava and Monte Cassino made up partially for the loss of the papal stronghold. Unceasingly he upheld the principles of Gregory VII, yet not without mercy and moderation in dealing with individuals. He is, indeed, one of the noblest and holiest of the long line of superior men with whom Cluny endowed the Church of the eleventh century. The idea of the Crusade, that may have dawned vaguely a century before in the mind of Sylvester II, was preached with extraordinary eloquence and success by Urban II at the Council of Clermont in 1095. Fr. Paulot strives very hard to vindicate for this pope the sole proprietorship of the idea of the Crusade, yet it must be admitted that he might have taken it over from his master in statecraft, Gregory VII, who certainly had in view the succor of Constantinople, from which to the conquest of Palestine the transition is not far. Gregory died (1085) in the midst of his conflict with the emperor—the succeeding popes changed little in his plans and methods, for they were, like him, the instruments of a policy that had been long before excogitated near Mâcon in the solitudes of the vast abbey by the winding Grosne. May it not be that from Cluny, too, came the original masterly concept of a military enterprise, that should at once distract the public attention from the *impasse* of an embittered domestic conflict, arouse and console scandalized faith, unite discordant ecclesiastical and civil elements, and elevate the papacy in public opinion by bringing it again into close personal contact with the Sepulchre of its divine founder, as though seeking a new consecration and a new mission?

Fr. Paulot follows almost slavishly the chronological order in his narrative—much space is thereby lost by repetition of similar events, consecrations of churches and altars, visits of monasteries, judicial decisions, and the like. A multitude of interesting details are scattered through the volume, that might well have been collected under suitable rubrics; for instance, the evidences of the pope's concern for the welfare of the monasteries might well have been worked into a general description of the nature and workings of the wonderful establishment of Cluny and its almost countless filial houses. There is wanting, too, a chapter on the political, economical, and social conditions of the time; the helplessness and degradation of the diocesan clergy can only be understood fully in the light of its poverty, imperfect recruitment, dependency, and the uncertainty of peaceful tenure owing to the yoke of feudalism and the dubious status of a

multitude of bishops, distracted for a whole generation between pope and emperor. The original sources are not described and evaluated, as is usual in a work of this kind, an omission all the more regrettable as Fr. Paulot does not spare his adjectives in dealing with the historians of the emperor's party. Some account of the famous "*libelli de lite imperatoris et papæ*," was really needed to enable the reader to judge with impartiality. Similarly a description of the authorities for the preaching of the first Crusade would have been welcome, an easy task after the great labors of Riant and Röhricht. There is no index to the book, always a grave blemish, and particularly so in a work filled with details. The bibliography is incomplete and badly arranged. The German literature on the subject is drawn on with a sparing hand, and in general the work takes on the air of a panegyric—a superabundance of light with a minimum of shadow. The pages on the "*cursus leoninus*" outline the results of several charming literary studies on the peculiarly musical papal style of the eleventh and twelfth centuries, which owes its introduction to that brilliant master of the "*ars dictaminis*," Urban II. For the "*cultus*" of the pope Fr. Paulot has brought together all the available evidence beginning with the veneration shown his memory by the monks of his beloved Cava. The veneration of the Blessed Virgin owes not a little to this pope—to him are referred the Ave Maris Stella, the mass *Salve Sancta Parens*, the evening Angelus, the Little Hours of Our Lady, the Saturday office in her honor, whether with accuracy or not remains unsettled. In spite of some drawbacks of form and construction this work is an excellent one and destined to bring out favorably the figure of a great French pope who feared no king, not even his own, and who, for the decade of his reign, held aloft the banner of the papacy on the sublime height where the most dauntless of that long line had placed it.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN:

The English Church in the Sixteenth Century from the accession of Henry VIII to the death of Mary. By James Gairdner, C.B. New York: Macmillan, 1902. 8°, pp. xvii + 430.

The generally flattering reception given by the English-reading world to this latest history of the Reformation in England is well deserved. We have at last an honest and reliable account of that great religious revolution from the pen of a man fitted in every way to perform the task. Only one fault—if fault it be—can be urged. It is not brilliant as a story. For which reason Froude's travesties on the same period are still likely to prove the storehouse of informa-

tion for the average non-student reader. But is it a fault? There are two ways of writing history. One, the older, is to start out with a preconceived thesis and group around it artistically all the facts that have any relations to it. So wrote Froude. As a result we have a fascinating story, but precious little history. The other, that followed by the author, is to tell the facts chronologically, just as he finds them, leaving them to produce their natural conclusion unassisted by any historical philosophy of the author. The result is a plain, unvarnished tale, rather tedious in the recital, but anyhow it is history, pure and simple, and that is what the English world has been in need of ever since England cut loose, or was cut loose, from the communion of the Church.

What do the facts tell as we find them in this book? They tell with irresistible logic that the English Reformation was due almost entirely to the evil passions of one man, Henry VIII. To the new school of sociological historians, in whose calculations the individual, be he king or serf, plays but a small part in the making of history, such a conclusion will come as a disagreeable shock. But it is difficult to see how any reader can avoid accepting this conclusion if he has already accepted the premises, *i. e.*, the facts; and Mr. Gairdner's position as keeper of the state records of the Reformation period is ample warrant for accepting them. All through that tangled web of religious politics we can trace with ease the one dominant policy of Henry—namely, to secure his divorce from Katherine, to stave off foreign criticism of it by keeping the sovereigns of Europe at loggerheads with one another, to crush out criticism at home by coercing Parliament, by encouraging heresy and killing anyone bold enough to oppose him. A reviewer, of course, cannot go into all these details, but if ever a nation of free people was bedevilled, befooled, and dragooned out of its faith, that nation was England, the boasted land of civil and religious liberty. The mother of parliaments had become the slave and the mistress of royal absolutism. Far more truthfully than Louis XIV could Henry Tudor say of himself "I am the State." Once embarked on his downward course, he pursued it with characteristic Tudor obstinacy. At his death it was too late to bring England back to the old faith. Though, had a Catholic immediately succeeded him, or had even poor Mary been more skilful, enough might have been won back to constitute a respectable party. As it is, blunder succeeded blunder on the part of the Catholic leaders, until practically all was lost by the end of Elizabeth's reign.

The question arises, how was it possible for one man, even a

tyrant, to thus succeed, contrary to the plain wishes of his people? The answer is indeed difficult. The psychology of the English Reformation is one of the most baffling studies in all history. But we think Mr. Gairdner has struck upon the right solution. Briefly put, it is this: "The greater part of the clergy and bishops resigned themselves to the new state of affairs, which many thought so forced and artificial that it *could not possibly last long*" (p. 155); but when it did last then the leaders in the Church were like Cranmer "compelled to face the question as to the *true relations between Church and State* in a way which no one thinks of in these days of ease; and he was conscious that the old spiritual empire of Rome, dependent, as it had been all along, on the support of Christian princes and nations, could no longer be maintained when one powerful sovereign cast it off. If the act of that sovereign was not an intolerable outrage to the whole of Christendom, compelling other princes to treat Henry as an enemy, no less dangerous than the Turk, then it followed that the Church of England must obey the ruler of England in things both temporal and spiritual. And if so, then it further followed that doctrines which were, in the last resort, only upheld by papal authority could not be essential doctrines of Christianity" (pp. 375-376); "And however little men loved royal authority over the Church, it was certainly a question which perplexed some consciences whether resistance was even justifiable; for if the king took upon him the responsibility of supreme headship, and had so much power to make his position respected, was it not after all, a right thing to obey?" (p. 197). "Responsibility must always rest with him who has absolute power, and dares to go all lengths" (198).

At first reading, and from a point of view of strict logic such a view will appear absurd. But it nevertheless contains the key to the understanding of that period of English history. The fundamental reason of the success of the Reformation in England (and perhaps everywhere else) was not its quality of heresy. Heresy, it is true, came *pari passu*. But the efficient cause was a political one. Ever since the days of Wycliffe and Marsiglio of Padua, the one great fact of Church history was the ever-increasing absorption of the Church by the State. Friends during the Middle Ages proper, they are bitter foes from Dante to Luther. With Luther the State is supreme. Here is the core, the fibre, the *raison d'être*, the quintessence of Protestantism. This is what keeps it alive to-day, when as a theological and philosophical system it is an acknowledged failure and as an historical expression of the Church of Christ it is a contradiction in terms. It never was a heresy fundamentally,

though heresy of every conceivable variety sprung from it. It was a world-wide sociological and political revolution, destructive of all the traditional relations, political, financial, legal and social, between the Church universal and each particular nation. The Church had crushed the Empire. The nations of Europe in part have crushed her. Until she is once again free, until the hand of the State is off her throat, she will not recover her lost ground. But that is a consummation afar off, unless we realize the true nature of that Reformation, cease fighting its theological absurdities, things of straw, and transfer the battle to the only plane upon which we can come to a final issue, namely, the relations of Church and State, the proper limits of each, the proper duties of each.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

NOTRE DAME COLLEGE, BALTIMORE.

L'Apollinarisme. Etude historique, littéraire et dogmatique sur le début des controverses christologiques au IV^e siècle. Par Guillaume Voisin. Louvain: Van Linthout, 1901. Pp. 429.

This volume embodies the author's doctorate dissertation presented to the Catholic University of Louvain. Highly creditable and timely in view of the unsympathetic research which rationalists of late have been conducting in the field of christology, this dissertation is a distinct contribution to the unravelling of an historical and theological tangle. The presentation is clear, the criticism cogent, and the reconstruction original as well as suggestive.

Apollinaris of Laodicea was the first to precipitate the discussion of christology proper when, about the middle of the fourth century he raised the question: what is the mode of union of the divine person of Christ with his human nature? Up to this time, during the Arian and Trinitarian controversies, the object of investigation and debate had been the divine rather than the human side of Christ, his relations to the Father rather than his relations to the humanity which he assumed. Arius, it is true, had previously contended that the "lesser" divinity of Christ was united to a soulless human body. But this theory of Arius seems to have escaped the attention of most of the Fathers, intent on safeguarding the divinity of the Son, and wholly absorbed in questions concerning the Trinity. In fact, this preoccupation with other theological interests is sufficient in itself to account for the failure during this period to discuss what a union of the divine and the human formally implied.

Apollinaris shifted the theological debate from the divine to the human side of Christ, and thus deserves to be singled out among

heresiarchs as one who contributed to the development of Christian doctrine. A teacher of rhetoric in his early years, a skillful dialectician, hebraist, and exegete, to whom, in the latter capacity, St. Jerome acknowledges his indebtedness as a pupil; a man of irreproachable moral life, a staunch defender of the Trinity, and afterwards bishop of his own native Laodicea, he fell a victim to the difficulty which the union of two perfect natures in a single person presented to his reason. This was the rock of scandal to the faith of one who had so stoutly defended the doctrine of consubstantiality as to win the favor and esteem of the most illustrious doctors of his time; who had so opposed the dualism of the Antiochians and put the personal unity of Christ beyond the reach of their captious criticism that the very force of the reaction, one might almost say, carried him over to the other extreme, and led him to champion the view that the divine Person of the Son was united to a human body without soul or intelligence. The aged Fathers who had already borne the brunt of the Arian attack, were again compelled to take the field, this time against an old companion in arms who, by his prestige, piety and learning, had become all the more dangerous as an enemy.

After thus introducing Apollinaris to his readers, the author shows very clearly that the profession of faith in the integrity of Christ's human nature made by the Fathers at the Council of Alexandria in 362 was not restricted to a condemnation of Arianism, but extended to Apollinarism as well, although Apollinaris himself was as yet not suspected of heresy, having made no public statement of his views. It was after the Council and during the lively debates to which this profession of faith gave rise, that Apollinaris went over to the enemy. This contention of the author strikes at the root of the counter-theories proposed by Harnack and Stülcken; it also helps to vindicate Athanasius from the charge—preferred by Stülcken—of having been at heart an adherent of Apollinaris.

But what led the bishop of Laodicea to precipitate this issue concerning the human constitution of Christ? The general opinion has been that the Arian doctrine was the prime source of his inspiration: he simply foresaw and stated the conclusions to which Arianism inevitably led. The author finds such a view untenable in the light of later research, and adduces solid proof from history as well as from textual study that Apollinaris was a product of the religious spirit of the Antiochians and the rationalizing tendency of the Alexandrians, an Aristotelian without a spark of Platonism in his mental life. While the Fathers were still defending the Trinitarian doctrines of the Council of Nice, Apollinaris was absorbed in the question

of Christ's unity, for which he sought a rational explanation. A new problem thus arose in his mind out of the very circumstances and needs of his own peculiar environment. He tried to solve it and failed; a problem that was local and almost personal then became the common concern of all; Apollinaris hitherto in conflict with the Antiochians found himself at odds with the Church, and his condemnation soon followed. The author next describes how Apollinaris was gradually led to admit a division of human nature into body, soul, and spirit, and to contend that in Christ the divinity replaced the spirit and entered into direct union with a body whose soul was purely animal. Pressed by his adversaries to acknowledge in Christ a perfect man, he had to fall back upon trichotomy as a last resort, and by quotations from Scripture endeavor to establish that man's nature was threefold and not dual. Here again the influences that formed him are to be sought in the concrete necessities of the controversy in which he was engaged, and not in any special attachment to the doctrine of trichotomy which he adopted merely because he found it a most serviceable means of self-defense.

The rapid rise of Apollinarism was followed by an equally rapid decline. After the heresiarch's death the secular arm was stretched out to put a stop to the spread of this doctrine among his followers. The disastrous influence exercised by Apollinaris over all those who professed with him the unity of Christ's nature left a serpent's trail over the several phases of Monophysism that subsequently appeared during the fifth and sixth centuries. This influence was greatly aided and abetted by the fraud of disciples who endeavored to secure a respectable patronage for their views by ascribing to Julius, Gregory, Athanasius and others works that were afterwards, but too late to avert consequences, found to be productions of Apollinaris himself. The origin of Eutychianism the author regards as chiefly due to this fraudulent tradition invented by the Apollinarists to give likelihood to their contentions.

This first part of the author's work is highly suggestive because of the fuller critical knowledge with which he approaches the history of Apollinarism. Full justice cannot be done his presentment within the space allotted to this review. Suffice it to say that in his introductory review of the development of Christology, the sources and literature of the subject, as well as in the study of the influences which determined Apollinaris to beat out a new path of theological inquiry he has added to the quality, and sometimes to the sum of human knowledge. The latter addition is seen in the fuller light which he has thrown upon the hitherto fragmentary history of the Apollinarist

sect after the death of the founder, no less than in the tracing of the influence which Apollinaris exercised on the recrudescence of Gnostic speculations in the fifth century.

The second part of the work is taken up with a study of the Apollinarist literature as known to the writers of the fourth and fifth centuries; the fraud of the disciples and its temporary success; the authentic writings of Apollinaris and his followers; the Apollinarian source of the pseudepigraphies; the writings to be attributed to the disciples and those falsely ascribed to the heresiarch himself. Meagre material for reconstructing the doctrine of Apollinaris is to be found in the works of his adversaries, whose general acquaintance with the Laodicean's views, while undoubted, does not imply familiarity with particular writings; and so the author wisely avoids conjecture and sets forth what the facts warrant in the case of each individual. Were it not for the fraud of the disciples in attaching honored names to their master's writings, but little could be known with surety concerning this heresy. The success which this fraud met with was due to the judicious distribution of the master's heretical ideas among doctrines of an orthodox nature on the unity of Christ and the Trinity, which he had earlier held in common with his contemporaries. Egypt was probably the place in which the fraud was first perpetrated, and it seems strange that Saint Cyril failed to detect it when drawing so largely upon interpolated sources to refute Nestorius. Yet, such was the case. Not until John, bishop of Scythopolis in Galilee, had found some old copies of the heresiarch's writings about the middle of the sixth century was the fraud fully unmasked, to which result the unknown author of the "*Adversus fraudes Apollinaristarum*" had about the same time contributed.

In the critical reconstruction of the works of Apollinaris which the author next undertakes, there is much of value and interest to the student of Church history and the development of dogma. The supposed profession of faith made by the Council of Nice against Paul of Samosata is shown by the author to be quite possibly due to the fraudulent insertion of Apollinarists; likewise the ascription to Athanasius of works that reveal the mind of the Laodicean and the hand of his disciples. The author recognizes the value which the pretended correspondence between Apollinaris and Basil would have for reconstructing the history of the sect, but does not regard these letters as authentic. The second part of the author's work is a fine piece of historical criticism.

After thus determining his sources, the author proceeds to reconstruct the christological view professed by Apollinaris. The

third part of the volume is devoted to this dogmatic study, and presents many features out of the ordinary which are worthy of attention.

Apollinaris worked out a detailed system of christology. The first to put the question how the divine and human elements in Christ are united in one and the same person, he was also the first to propose a solution of this knotty problem. Accepting on faith the fact of Christ's unity, he endeavored to explain it on the principles of Aristotle's philosophy which drew no distinction between nature and person, but considered both terms as wholly correlative. The result was the doctrine of a single nature in support of which the analogy of the union between the human soul and body was frequently adduced, although not regarded by Apollinaris as a perfect parity. He did not admit any degradation of the divine nature, or interfusion of the divine and human in the Incarnate Word, as has been so often stated, neither did he hold to any transformation of the divine. Such crudities formed no part of his christological system. He simply denied that Christ possessed a thinking and willing human spirit, conceding at the same time the possession of an animal soul. The reason for this denial was the consequence which he foresaw in an acknowledgment of a perfect human nature in Christ. As nature was the same as person to his way of thinking, the admission of a complete human nature in the God-Man would entail the admission of two persons, and this would destroy the fact revealed by faith that Christ was a concrete unity, a truth which he would not sacrifice at any cost.

The author next reconstructs the views of Apollinaris on the consequences of the incarnate union, and shows how the defective language employed by the Laodicean contributed to fix upon him unjustly the doctrines that Christ was consubstantial in the flesh with God and that his body preexisted. Of course, it was foregone according to his principles that Apollinaris should deny all strictly human acts to Christ and refuse to him the possession of a human will. The soteriology of the heresiarch, which the author sets forth in detail shows how consistently, though not without fault, a solution had been attempted in those early days. In successive chapters the author explains the gradual misunderstanding which was the fate of these many views of the Laodicean; examines into the opposition of the Fathers to his doctrine; criticizes the extreme interpretations put upon the language of the Fathers by Dorner and Harnack, who deny that the latter professed any more clearly than Apollinaris himself the distinction of natures in Christ; sets forth the teaching of the

Church, and discusses the relation of Apollinarism to the progress of dogma. In a final appendix the Trinitarian doctrine of Apollinaris is reviewed, and certainly the author is right in contesting the statement of Harnack, that the Bishop of Laodicea was the chief promoter of orthodox teaching on the Trinity, and the statement of Draeseke that he was "facile princeps" among the doctors of his time.

What the author has to say with regard to the relation of Apollinarism to the development of Christian doctrine is specially significant in the light of recent events and deserves at least a brief consideration.

Apollinaris, it will be remembered, gave a new direction to theological inquiry when he drew attention away from the divine side of Christ to the human, when he concentrated men's minds on the Incarnation rather than on the Trinity. The result was a development and expansion of doctrine which the critic must perforce interpret in relation to what had gone before. Was this development a substitution of one doctrine for another in the Hegelian sense, or a working over of Gospel data into formulas acceptable to the cultured minds of the Greeks, as Harnack would have it, or only a more complete, more scientific expression of the traditional faith of the Church, exhibiting continuity and identity as well as progress?

To assure one's self that there was no change in the objective deposit of revelation, one has but to note the fact, that the primitive Church believed that Jesus Christ was at the same time God and Man and registered this belief in the Apostles' Creed, which was undeniably in use at Rome toward the close of the first century or at the beginning of the second, even in the admission of extreme critics who have not fully made out their case for this late origin of it. The Council of Chalcedon only reaffirmed this baptismal profession of faith in the God-Man when it defined the doctrine of one person in two natures, and so we have the conservation of the essential idea throughout as the first and chief mark of true development.

Besides, the definition of a truth as the object of universal belief is no proof of novelty or change, if instances of its formal profession preceded the definition. Of course, the positive doctrines of Christ true God consubstantial with the Father, true Man endowed with a perfect human nature, were not the object of scientific research, nor systematically set forth in their mutual relations at the very beginning. They were believed without being investigated. It is only by confounding the constant and continuous element of faith with the slowly formulated analysis of it, by mistaking systematic interpretations of revealed facts for the arbitrary intrusion of new beliefs that the rationalist is enabled to construct his theory of development as the successive substitution of one doctrine for another.

The doctrine of the two natures in Christ affirmed by the Church of the fourth century on the occasion of the controversy with Apollinaris is a peremptory refutation of the theory that an objective change was introduced into the deposit of revelation. The Church then believed that Christ is truly man, come really in the flesh as the world's Redeemer. Apollinaris himself is witness to the fact that this was the universal persuasion accepted indisputably by all. Then Apollinaris raised the question whether the Christ possessed a rational soul. What was implicitly believed hitherto, was thereupon explicitly declared against his denial; and declared not as an extension, but as the very content of Christian truth from the beginning.

It was Apollinaris, not the Fathers, who introduced a change into the objective deposit; he, not they, sought to corrupt the belief. The Bishop of Laodicea furnished an occasion to the Church to express more precisely her belief in the Incarnation, but had nothing whatever to do with the Catholic solution of the problem which the Church stated. So cogent is this historical fact of the influence of tradition on the development of Christian doctrine that the rationalist recognizes its force to the full, when he seeks to find in the fourth Gospel and the distinction there made between the "Word" and the "Flesh" an anticipation of the Christology of Apollinaris which denied to the Logos the assumption of a human soul. The rationalist projects into the earliest Christian past a theory of the fourth century, fastens it upon some loosely employed hebraic expressions, and thereby secures, as he thinks, two hostile traditions which he thereupon proceeds to play off against each other as a serviceable means for showing how Apollinaris, and none other but he, drank fully of the well of Christian doctrine undefiled.

We recommend this volume to the careful consideration of professors and students of Church History and Dogma. Now that the idea of development is in the air an ounce of induction is worth a pound of theory. Facts may not always speak so loudly as words, but they speak more cogently. To have the literature on Apollinarism collected, sifted, criticized, and corrected is a distinct advantage. To have the early sources of Christology judiciously discussed, is a still greater gain. For these reasons we wish this volume of Doctor Voisin a wide circulation.

EDMUND T. SHANAHAN.

Onward and Upward. A Year-Book compiled from the discourses of Archbishop Keane by Maurice Francis Egan. Baltimore: John Murphy Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 387.

According to the preface of this compilation, "its main object is

to give to earnest men and women, often too busy for long meditation, a spiritual keynote for each day in the year. And Archbishop Keane knows our country and the human heart, our conditions and our struggles and temptations so well, that from the work of no other man could be drawn sentiments at once so spiritual and so practical, so stimulating and so sustaining for the great mass of the American people." The twelve sections of the work are entitled Right Living, Religion, Home, Education, The Ideal Woman, The Ideal Man, Civilization, The Social Ideal, America, Progress, Art, Brotherhood, Death and Resurrection. For each day a thought is selected from the discourses of Archbishop Keane, corresponding to these general headings; thus a body of doctrine is brought together, at once brief, compact, well-divided, and easily assimilable. The purpose of these thoughts, scattered only in appearance, is eminently a helpful and directive one—excellent educational principles and suggestions, for young and old, are to be found all through the work, and not alone in the chapter specially dedicated to that topic. The editor rightly says that it is impossible to transfer to the printed page the many oratorical qualities of the Archbishop of Dubuque. Nevertheless, it is equally impossible for any reader to peruse these pages without catching something of the unction and the candor of the writer, something of the abundant persuasiveness of his manner and character. Possibly many readers will draw solace, encouragement, and inspiration from these echoes of a long and fruitful career as a preacher of Catholic truth who would never read through the original discourses themselves.

A table of contents and an index of subjects treated would improve the work. We wish it the widespread circulation it deserves, and trust that it is only the forerunner of other contributions to our ecclesiastical literature from the pen of one who needs no introduction to an American audience, and to praise whose constant zeal and charity in the work of his ministry would be almost an impertinence, so much are they household words among us.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

La Sociologie Positiviste : Comte. By Maurice Defourney, Institut Supérieur de Philosophie. Louvain, 1902. 1 vol., 8°, pp. 370.

This volume on the life and doctrine of Auguste Comte is an interesting addition to the literature of Sociology. It appears in the series of philosophical publications issued by the Institute of Philosophy in the University of Louvain and is certainly a creditable addition to it.

After a brief sketch of the life of Comte, the author presents a lucid exposition of his theory of sociology. The second part of the work contains a systematic critical appreciation of the theory. That is followed by a brief synopsis of the permanent elements in Comte's teaching, and by several documents which show the relation of positivism to Catholicity and to Socialism. The author has done his work with every evidence of care and of fairness. While not a believer in Comte as a philosopher, there is scarcely a trace of prejudice against him in any part of the exposition. The critical portion of the work is admirable for the objective manner in which the author attempts to set aside the social theory of the great positivist.

The interest in Comte and his sociology is not as great as formerly, though interest in sociology itself was never greater. Comte is of course a permanent character in the history of sociological theory. His merit is very great for having pointed to the field of the science before it had explorers. Those who are unacquainted with him and his works will find in Dr. Defourney's volume a most attractive and useful introduction to that study. It has been said often that what is permanent in the six volumes of Comte's *Philosophy*, might be expressed in a couple of paragraphs. The author proves the statement by doing so. The variety of influences which have affected sociology since his time has been so great that the science has drifted far away from the point where Comte discovered it. However, Comte emphasized the question of method—and method is still the vital thing to sociology. Hence Dr. Defourney's volume is very useful to the sociologist who would study Comte for the sake of knowing his method and of seeing it applied to the whole field of social phenomena.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Discoveries of the Norsemen in America, with special relation to their early cartographical representation. By Joseph Fischer, S.J., translated from the German by Basil H. Soulsby, B.A. St. Louis: Herder, 1903. 8°, pp. xxiv + 130.

That hardy Norsemen had reached the American coast as early as the year 1000, and that for two centuries at least, more or less frequent relations existed between the Northern lands and the new discoveries, has long been admitted. The epoch-making work of Carl Christian Rafn entitled "*Antiquitates Americanæ*" (1839) made known such convincing documents from Norse literature that the thesis has never since been gainsaid with success. But to what extent were these discoveries known through Europe in the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries? Did they ever find their way into the mediæval

maps or navigators' charts of that period known as "portulanos?" What probability is there that this information drifted into Southern Europe in the course of the fifteenth century, to become one of the sources of the faith of Columbus in a western world? Distinguished scholars, Norse and German, French and Italian, have long been busy at the genesis of the earliest maps of the New World, particularly at the additions to Ptolemy, which begin with the Dane Claudius Clavus, in the first quarter of the fifteenth century, and show the outline of the great Norse discovery of "Engronelant" or Greenland. It would seem that this now famous Dane had his work executed in Italy, and was thus the first known oral witness to make known to the peninsula the outlines of the nearest portion of the New World.

Another Northern savant, Donnus Nicolaus Germanus, learned German priest and humanist, perhaps printer and miniator, issued a work known as "Cosmographia" in 1466, 1470, and in 1482—in the second and third editions are found maps of the Northern lands and Greenland. The second edition is dedicated to Paul II (1464–1471), though the original edition was prepared at the expense of Duke Borsio d'Este and dedicated to him. There were, therefore, current in Italy during the fifteenth century manuscripts of Ptolemy, which contained maps of Greenland, though the American coast of Helluland, Markland and Wineland the Good does not appear. A letter of Nicholas V. dated 1448, deals with the wretched condition of the inhabitants of Greenland, and another of Alexander VI, given in 1492 or 1493, bears witness not only to the extremity of their temporal and spiritual destitution, but also to an accurate knowledge of the climatic conditions. There are therefore excellent cartographical and historical reasons for believing that in fifteenth century Italy some general knowledge of Greenland was current enough for a man like Columbus to become possessed of it, nor is it necessary to send the Genoese navigator to Iceland to hear from Bishop Magnus of Skalholt the story of the Norse discoveries. Though the earliest Icelandic maps of these American discoveries date only from the end of the sixteenth century, there is a fifteenth century "portulano" that shows to the south of Greenland a little circular island called Markland. Columbus may have seen such a map. In another map of the year 1500 there appear, besides Greenland (Illa Verde), the islands of Frixlanda and Brazil. Already in 1498 merchants of Bristol had for seven years been sending out annually two, three, and even four caravels in search of this island of Brazil—not improbably the Hy-Brasil of the mediæval Irish, that "insula Sancti Brendani" which disappeared from the maps only in the eighteenth century, after holding its own on

every portulano or navigator's chart since the fourteenth. The news and the nature of these Norse discoveries would naturally travel to Rome with bishops, pilgrims, penitents, students, merchants, monks, and other classes of the Norse population regularly drawn thither, as Werlauff pithily says, by "*pietatis studium, absolutio, negotia.*" The most northern bishoprics were founded in the twelfth century—Lund in 1104, Drontheim in 1152, Holar in Iceland in 1106, the Faröes in 1152, and Gardar in Greenland, 1123. Cardinal Nicholas of Albano, afterwards Hadrian IV, was legate in Norway from 1154 to 1159, nor was he the only papal legate to visit the far North. Crusading Danes rested long in Constantinople and Rome, and the port of Bergen was at the same time a much frequented one by travellers and merchants from many parts of Europe.

The work of Fr. Fischer is at once the latest and most instructive of the numerous introductions to the history of these early discoveries of America. He has had the good fortune to discover, at Wolfegg Castle in Germany, not only the only known manuscript of the third edition of the "*Cosmographia*" of Donnus Nicolaus Germanus, but also the long lost first map of Martin Waldseemüller, executed in 1507, the map that showed to the world for the first time the name America.

Scarcely less important is his discovery, in the same place, of the *Carta Marina* of 1516, also executed by Waldseemüller. By these discoveries and labors, Fr. Fischer has linked his name to those of Von Wieser, Storm, Ruge, Nordenskiöld and other littérateurs of the Northern geography of the fifteenth century. His work, notably pp. 57–107, may serve as an introduction to their minute researches in a hitherto untrodden field. As a preliminary to his cartographical chapters, Fr. Fischer discusses all the known historical evidence for Norse discoveries and settlements in America. His knowledge of the sources and of the modern literature is quite extensive, and his critical method sane and scholarly. Indeed he rather leans to the extreme in his unwillingness to accept some traditional theses—in this peculiar *silva* of materials one must abate somewhat the pretensions of a too strict criticism. We miss in the bibliography the remarkable work of Edward Payne, "*History of the New World called America*" (1892, 1899), and the "*Brendaniana*" of Fr. O'Donoghue (1893).

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Papst Innocenz XI und Ungarns Befreiung von der Türkenherrschaft. Von Wilhelm Fraknói, aus dem Ungarischen übersetzt von Dr. Peter Jekel. Freiburg: B. Herder, 1902. 8°, pp. vii + 288.

One of the immediate results of the revolt of Luther was an in-

crease of military activity on the part of the Osmanli, then fresh from the conquest of Constantinople and hopeful of planting the banner of the Crescent in all the other centres of Christendom. The great battle of Mohács (1526) made the Turk master of the fairest lands of Hungary and set him up as an European power. One of the great national romances of history is the struggle then inaugurated by the Magyars against the Turkish yoke, a struggle that fills the best part of two centuries (1526-1685), and ended only with the successful siege of Ofen in the latter year. Thereby the capital of Hungary was won back for the nation and Christianity. With that famous siege closed the splendid series of Christian successes—the Relief of Vienna (1683), the naval victory of Navarinna (1685)—that relieve the otherwise calamitous annals of the seventeenth century. It has been almost forgotten that the soul of the combination between Poland and Austria, whereby the liberation of Hungary became possible, was Pope Innocent XI, Benedetto Odescalchi. It was he who won over Poland and secured the leadership of the chivalrous Sobieski, he who kept up an uneasy peace between Louis XIV and the Hapsburgs, he who poured into the ruined treasury of the latter the incredible sums of money that made possible the vast operations of that famous decade and utterly surpassed all the capacities of the Turk, he who confiscated for the national cause one third of all the property of the Hungarian monks, and secured soldiers and money from many of the German and Austrian feudatories of the empire. His memory is otherwise held in benediction for his manly courage and his high devotion to the interests of the papacy, but nowhere has he right to a higher honor than in Hungary that owes him its national existence and unity. All historians acknowledge that the critical hour of life or death had struck for that people. James II of England declared that for many centuries no pope had deserved so well of Christendom. The pope's nephew, Livio Odescalchi, was made Duke of Sirmium, and in 1751 the Hungarian Assembly conferred on his son the rights of citizenship, declaring that the nation still held in grateful memory the zeal, solicitude, and generosity of his ancestor, whereby the sworn enemy of Europe and Christianity was rendered powerless forever. The Odescalchi are still an influential family of Hungary, and may boast of a title to nobility second to none in Europe. In 1885 Hungary celebrated the second centenary of the Siege of Ofen, and on that occasion one of her most scholarly historians, William Fraknói, published a learned volume that revealed all the merits of the great pope, in diplomacy, encouragement, cooperation and generosity. This work now appears in a German translation, and is well worthy of

attentive perusal by all who are interested in the public and political history of the papacy. *Ex pede Herculem*. This last chapter of the Crusades, for that is what it is, deserves to be forever remembered. Were it not for the Bishops of Rome there would be to-day no Christian Europe. From Jerusalem to Vienna, from Lepanto to Navarinna, from Constantinople to Ofen, the Turk met everywhere in the papacy a foeman worthy of his faith, his steel, and his undeniable courage. Were it not for the irremediable domestic schism, that enemy would long since have driven him from the Golden Horn and given back to Christian worship and service, Christian love and Christian polity, art and life, the glorius spaces of Sancta Sophia and all they stand for. *Veniat sicut mercenarii optata dies!*

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Philosophy of the Christian Religion. By A. M. Fairbairn, D.D., LL.D., Principal of Mansfield College, Oxford. London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1902. 8°, pp. xxviii + 583.

"This book may be described as an attempt to do two things: first, to explain religion through nature and man; and secondly, to construe Christianity through religion"—such, in the author's words, is the purpose of this remarkable work. In the first part of the book Dr. Fairbairn lays the philosophical foundations of the Christian religion; in the second part he deals directly with "the central fact and idea" of the Christian faith.

Religion rests on a basis of reason. Hence our author begins with a philosophy of nature. He shows that nature must be conceived through the supernatural and that man is the key of all mysteries. In stating the case for Theism Principal Fairbairn faces frankly what is the main apology for agnostic pessimism—the problem of evil. He makes no new contribution of thought to the venerable controversy, but he restates and reaffirms with much force and eloquence the theistic solution of the question: "if it were good to have moral beings under moral law, evil must be permitted." Further: "to allow evil to become and continue without any purpose of Redemption is an absolutely inconceivable act in a good and holy and gracious God." In the section dealing with the Philosophy of Religion we have a valuable review of the History of Religion. In analyzing the subjective and objective factors of religion, in formulating the relation of the founder to the religion of his founding, in describing the causes of variation in religion and in handling kindred topics, Dr. Fairbairn brings out into relief many principles which are too often ignored or misunderstood by students of comparative religion. No one who

has before his eyes the current abuses of the Science of Religion can read Principal Fairbairn's canons for the proper use of Ethnography, or his discussion of the question whether all religions are variations of one religion, without feeling that he has said many things which needed to be said, and which few could say so well as he has said them.

Having established his philosophical prologomena, Dr. Fairbairn in the second half of the work, devotes his attention especially to determining the relation of Christ to Christianity. His position is clearly defined in the words: "The Christian religion is not built upon faith in Jesus of Nazareth, but upon the belief that He was the Christ, the Son of the living God." This thesis he finds in the Synoptics, in the claims of Christ—"claims representing a sovereignty which only a singular and preeminently privileged relation to the Father could justify"—in the Fourth Gospel, the Apocalypse, the Epistles of St. Paul, etc. Worthy of special note is the argument built upon the fact that while other religions have lifted their founders to a superhuman rank, Christianity alone has worshipped its Founder as God, and has moreover thereby given to the world a more exalted and universal conception of the Deity.

To state Christian doctrine in relation to the thought of the day—this is a work for which the time is ripe. Principal Fairbairn has laid down the lines of the synthesis and has shown that the claims of Christianity are compatible with the frankest admission of the claims of reason and critical science. To this coordination he has brought a marvelous grasp of all the questions in philosophy and history that bear on Christianity, and an eloquence that cannot be matched in recent religious literature. For such a work as Harnack's "What is Christianity?" he has provided a much needed antidote. Against the fundamental thesis of the Berlin historian who would leave to Christ no place in His Gospel, Principal Fairbairn has proved that "without the metaphysical conception of Christ the Christian religion would long ago have ceased to live."

It is a matter for regret and surprise that Dr. Fairbairn did not bring to his strictures on Catholic doctrines that sympathy and insight which are so conspicuous in the rest of his pages. We were prepared for his views on the Eucharist, but we were hardly prepared for the assertion that if the dogma of the Immaculate Conception be logical "not only Mary, but all her ancestors and ancestresses back to Adam, were immaculately conceived." Still less did we expect to find in such a book such a sentence as this: "Nothing fills me with darker horror or deeper aversion than the apotheosis of wounds and death which the Roman Church offers as the image of Christ."

However, it is not the first time that "the foremost theologian of England" has shown how vast and varied learning may go hand in hand with a somewhat crude conception of the system and the spirit of Catholicism.

HUMPHREY MOYNIHAN.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

Rich and Poor in the New Testament. By Orello Cone, D.D.
New York: Macmillan, 1902. Pp. vi + 245.

One reads this book with mixed impressions. The smooth literary English and inviting typography carry the reader along through the discussion of an interesting topic, and one peruses the book to the end, in spite of the constant recurrence of ideas which, however, delicately phrased, jar on orthodox sensibilities, and are utterly at variance with Catholic faith. When it is said that the author is a contributor to the *Encyclopædia Biblica*, the reader will know in a general way what to expect. Jesus the "son of a mechanic" is of course a transcendent Teacher, but not without his limitations and illusions, especially regarding the coming of the Kingdom. The fact that he regarded the Parousia as impending shortened his perspective of earthly conditions, and disturbed the judgment of his Apostles and followers on social relations. Hence the radical teaching of the intrinsic evil of riches, the now impracticable injunction to renounce all things, not to resist the evil-doer, and so forth. In the work under review, one is always coming upon unsuspected difficulties raised by German criticism—solved sometimes variously but often with tempting plausibility, however inadmissible the solutions are to one following the principles and analogies of Catholic theology. Not all are fitted to successfully resist the insidious influence of such a book as this where the hypotheses and conclusions of rationalistic criticism impregnate a composition of alluring theme and style, while strenuous protest is almost disarmed by the calm scholarly tone, and the high value admirably set upon the teachings of Our Lord and the New Testament *in general*.

After the critical process has done its work and eliminated from Christ's and the apostles' doctrine concerning earthly goods, what is of doubtful authenticity or merely transient value, the residuum is found by our author to contain principles and inspirations of great virtue for the betterment of modern social conditions. The surest and most satisfactory part of Dr. Cone's work, because the least negative, is the chapter on the New Testament and the Social Question of To-Day, though naturally it is tinged with humanitarianism. Of the New Testament in this relation the writer says with

truth: "Principles, the seeker will find in it, not system." "The effective remedy will be found, not in a new system, but in a new spirit." Materialism is decried, the paramount claims of spiritual life and aims upheld.

Yet the liberal Protestant and rationalist exegesis of the day is always missing the higher spirituality of the inspired text. The hard, dry literalism of this school robs the words of more than half their meaning. The historico-literal method of interpretation is the only solid *basis* for a right understanding of the sacred text, but to stop at that is, in general, to take the symbol and leave the reality, to feed on the letter which by itself killeth and discard the quickening spirit. The same error often puts the inspired authors unnecessarily at variance with one another. The higher transcendent truth, which is the key to synthesize them, is missing or contemptuously disregarded by the critics of whom I speak. For instance, Dr. Cone finds Matthew and Luke in hopeless disagreement, because the former reports the first beatitude as: "Blessed are the poor in spirit"—and the latter: "Blessed are ye poor," and he decides in favor of Luke's version in its literal sense.

Why cannot both be right, within their scope, Luke transmitting the letter, and Matthew the broad, spiritual meaning of the maxim—a sense implied in Luke's context, or the circumstances in which the words were spoken? Similarly for "Blessed ye who hunger now." To say that the hunger of the disciples, to which a blessing is attached, is merely a physical hunger, and that the recompense promised is merely a physical satisfaction, is to sadly misread the Sermon on the Mount.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

Die Beiden Ersten Erasmus Ausgaben des Neuen Testaments und ihre Gegner. Von Prof. Dr. Aug. Bludau. Herder, 1902. (Biblische Studien, VII, 5.) Pp. vi + 145. 85 cents.

To Erasmus belongs the honor of giving to the world the first printed edition of the New Testament in Greek. Scholars will find in this monograph a detailed account of its publication and that of the editions immediately following. The Greek was accompanied by an original Latin translation which differed much from the Vulgate, and this departure, together with the annotations in which the great humanist defended his text and version against the anticipated cavilings of scholastic learning and "monkish theology" gave rise to a series of controversies and discussions with various scholars and divines, including Luther, who had not yet broken with the Church,

and with Dr. Eck, the heresiarch's later antagonist. All countries were represented by these critics, some of whom were friendly and some acrimoniously personal. Erasmus was accused of favoring mostly all the heresies in the catalogue, including Arianism, Eutychianism, Pelagianism, Apollinarism and finally Lutheranism. From among these disputes the author has chosen those which best illustrate the strife between the humanists and scholastics on the eve of the Reformation. As is well known, Erasmus sympathized with the first movements of the Reformers; the annotations of his New Testament exhibit this free and rather bold spirit inveighing against the complexity, burden and degeneracy of the ecclesiasticism of his day.

GEORGE J. REID.

ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Alberti, De Jejunio Ecclesiastico tractatus theoreticus et practicus. Rome: Pustet, 1903. 8°, pp. 80.

Casus Conscientiæ ad usum Confessariorum compositi et soluti, ab Augustino Lehmkuhl, S.J., vol. I, Casus de theologiæ moralis principiis et de præceptis atque officiis Christianis speciatim sumptis. Freiburg: Herder, 1903. 8°, pp. 566. \$2.40.

The Lady of the Lake, edited with notes and introduction by George Rice Carpenter. New York: Longmans, 1903. 8°, pp. xxiv + 191.

Reverend Mother Xavier Warde, The Story of Her Life, etc. Boston: Marlier & Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 287.

The Talisman. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York: Benziger, 1903. 8°, pp. 186.

The Pilkington Heir. By Anna T. Sadlier. New York: Benziger.

THE PONTIFICAL JUBILEE OF LEO XIII (1878-1903).

Leo XIII has been a great educational pope. It is probably the title he would himself choose as his best recommendation to posterity. Moderation and conciliation have been his watchwords among parties sects and factions bent either on the extermination of the truth or of one another. In all the ecclesiastical sciences he has been like the wise house-father, a preserver of what was old and good, and an apostle of what was useful in the new elements of progress. And now a more than patriarchal length of years is vouchsafed to him, whereby his services to Catholicism must always be seen in a certain romantic light. The latest successor of Peter seems to touch the Fisherman across the eventful centuries. Standing at his tomb he can see himself yet the centre of a world of Catholic faith and obedience that finds its *raison d'être* beneath the matchless dome that shelters the last resting place of Christ's first Vicar. First and last, the office is a teaching office, the sublimest *magisterium* the world has known, so sublime that the Holy Spirit has taken it under His own protecting care. Popes come and go, but their purpose lives on forever, and a new person is never wanting on whom to throw the mantle of succession and responsibility. Only, from time to time, the habitual grandeur of their dignity is heightened by circumstances, and among these is an exceptional length of service in an office to which men usually attain when already old, and whose cares are specially wearing and exhaustive.

The University celebrated with all due solemnity this marvellous event in the life of Leo XIII. A general holiday was proclaimed for Tuesday, March 3, in honor of the twenty-fifth anniversary feast of the Coronation of the Holy Father. At 9:30 A. M. Pontifical Mass was celebrated in the Divinity Chapel in the presence of the professors and students of the University. The Rt. Rev. Rector sang the pontifical mass. Rev. John W. Melody was assistant priest; Rev. Victor Ducat, of Detroit, deacon; Rev. Maurice O'Connor, of Boston, sub-

deacon, and Rev. William P. Clark, of Cincinnati, and Rev. Thomas E. McGuigan, of Baltimore, masters of ceremonies. At the close of the mass the *Te Deum* was intoned by the Rt. Rev. Rector as an act of thanksgiving to God for the many blessings that have come to the Church during the pontificate of Leo XIII, and in grateful recognition of the memorable equaling of the years of Peter.

At 11 o'clock the solemn academic exercises of the day were held in the *Aula Maxima* of McMahon Hall. The Rt. Rev. Rector presided. Seated on the platform were the professors of the various faculties and the representatives of the colleges and religious houses.

The Rt. Rev. Rector made the opening address and in it spoke feelingly of the character and services of the Holy Father. It would always be remembered that the founder of the University lived to see the years of Peter, and in this rare happening we might recognize an omen of good fortune for the years to come. The broad ocean might divide us from the Common Father of Christendom, but our hearts overleaped that barrier, and in spirit we were present at the glorious assembly in the Basilica of Saint Peter, beneath the matchless dome, members of the great Catholic family and rejoicing with it that God had seen fit to crown with extraordinary length of days the latest successor of the Fisherman. Leo XIII would be always remembered in the world's history for any one of his varied lines of intellectual activity and spiritual direction. But when he stands forth, as he now does, one of the three popes who in nineteen centuries have ruled the Christian world as long as the first Vicar of Jesus Christ, his fame will certainly be unperishable and his name remembered by the remotest posterity.

The following professors eulogized in turn the work of Leo XIII in their respective branches. Rev. Dr. Henry Hyvernât spoke of "*Leo XIII and Oriental Studies*"; Rev. Dr. Charles P. Grannan, of "*Leo XIII and the Biblical Commission*"; Rev. Dr. Thomas J. Shahan, on "*Leo XIII and the Science of Church History*"; Rev. Dr. Edward A. Pace, on "*Leo XIII and Scholastic Philosophy*"; Dr. William C. Robinson, on "*Leo XIII and the Science of Law*"; Rev. Dr.

William T. Kerby, on "Leo XIII and the Social Sciences," and Dr. Maurice Francis Egan, on "Leo XIII and Poetry." The closing address as made by Rev. Dr. Edmund T. Shanahan, professor of Dogmatic Theology and Dean of the theological faculty.

On the conclusion of these discourses, the following resolutions of congratulation were read by V. Rev. Dr. Shanahan, Dean of the Faculty of Theology.

Leo XIII, student, litterateur, sociologist, philosopher, civil governor, diplomat, statesman, priest, bishop, cardinal, pope, who shed the luster of his many-sided personality on these several careers; restorer of the philosophy and theology of St. Thomas to the place of honor in all Catholic schools; advocate of the synthetic spirit and sweeping world-view of the great Dominican as an offset to the extremes of the present-day specialization and as an incentive to a larger outlook upon the field of human knowledge; advocate, no less, of science and research, whereby the revelation of God in nature is daily increased, the hardships and discomforts of life are more and more diminished, and the truths from above are ever more surely seen to be in concert with the discoveries from below; exhorter of the clergy and the laity to a spirit of study in which investigation and reconstruction should go together; patron of the science of history, who encouraged the work of a number of independent investigators in history and liturgy by appointing them to membership on the historico-liturgical commission, who opened the doors of the Vatican archives to the scholars of the world and wrote the three supreme canons by which all historical research should be forever governed; patron no less of the biblical sciences, in the interest of which he has shown a scholar's zeal, for the direction of which he has latterly appointed a permanent commission; foreseeing friend of the poor and needy in a world whose fat and lean kine do not exhibit the proportions revealed in the dream of Joseph, his ancient homonym; spokesman of the rights of labor, the worth and dignity of the human individual, the ethical as against the purely economic appreciation of man; adversary of socialism and all movements threatening social order; exponent of the Christian constitution of civil governments, the mutual rights, duties and prerogatives of church and state in promoting, respectively, the spiritual and temporal good of their subjects; supporter of The Hague Conference and freely chosen arbiter of international disputes in the interests of universal peace; indefatigable promoter of harmony between the

churches of the West and the East, within and without the spiritual commonwealth of Christ, between embittered political and religious parties in his own and other lands; guardian of the Christian family and opponent of divorce; champion of Catholic piety, practice and tradition throughout the church universal; establisher of a larger and more solidified hierarchy for purposes of a more generous spiritual life; founder of the Catholic University of America for the inheritance of his spirit and the propagation of his ideas in the years that are to be; friend of this truly great Republic of the West, in which his watchful eyes have ever discerned a fair field for the beloved Church Catholic whose interests have been peculiarly his in the century of years with which we hope the Lord's bounty will crown him ere he takes his place among the peers of the church triumphant;

Wherefore, in the honor of this great Catholic leader, whose sword is of the spirit; in honor of this encyclopædic Pontiff, whose hospitable soul admitted an ailing and troubled world into the confidence and counsel of his sympathy; in honor of this Pope of solidarity, who strove to restore harmony between the natural and the supernatural, science and religion, faith and reason, piety and learning, and exemplified in his own matchless career the embodiment of the ideals which he taught; in honor of this advocate of peace, who sought the peace of the family, the workingman, the church, the state, and the reunion of all Christendom by his firmly gentle and gently firm method of conciliation, by his loftiness of purpose and nobility of aim; who ever rendered to Cæsar the things that are Cæsar's, and to God the things that are God's, protesting only with the righteousness of a holy cause against the despoilment of the patrimony of Peter's successors and his own enforced captivity; in honor of Leo XIII, in fine, our common spiritual father, founder and friend, be it, and it is hereby

Resolved, That we, the rector, professors and students of the Catholic University of America, in joint meeting assembled, after hearing the eulogistic discourses on our Holy Father pronounced by the members of the teaching staff of this institution, do mark this day as sacred in our annals and do hereby give public act of expression to our sense of loyalty, love, devotion and gratitude to this noble successor of the Fisherman, to whom it has been given to see the years of Peter, to whom it shall be given, God grant, to enjoy still greater length of days in governing the Kingdom of God and furthering the purpose of Him who died that all men might live.

These resolutions were unanimously adopted as the expression of the sentiments of filial love and veneration of the

University for its founder, Leo XIII. At the same time the cablegram of felicitation was sent; its text and the reply of the Holy Father are appended.¹

CARDINAL RAMPOLLA, ROME, ITALY: Beatissimo Patri Quem Diu Deus Sospitet Jubilæum Celebranti Universitatis Catholicæ Americæ Borealis Rector Doctores Alumni Concilium Concionesque Habentes Gratulantur Fundatori Patrono Amico Faustos Annos Fausta Omnia Precantur Sanctitatis Suae Pedibus Provoluti Benedictionem Apostolicam Enixe Petunt.

CONATY, *Rector*.

REPLY.

ILLMO. CONATY RECTORI UNIVERSITATIS CATHOLICÆ, WASHINGTON, Mar. 4, 1903: Beatissimus pater grato excepit animo devotionis sensa oblata in his pontificii jubilæi solemnibus et amantissime benedicit rectori doctoribus at alumni istius sibi acceptissimæ universitatis.

M. CARD. RAMPOLLA.

¹The rector, professors and students of the Catholic University of America, in joint meeting assembled for the purpose of celebrating the jubilee of Leo XIII, their father, founder, patron and friend, rejoice with him on this glorious day, wish him still greater fullness of years in the government of God's kingdom and humbly ask his apostolic blessing.

(*Reply.*) The Holy Father has received with great pleasure the expression of devotion conveyed to him on the occasion of his solemn pontifical jubilee, and most affectionately sends his blessing to the Rector, professors and students of the Catholic University, which Institution is very dear to him.

(Signed) M. CARD. RAMPOLLA.

NINTH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE ALUMNI ASSOCIATION.

The ninth annual meeting of the Alumni Association of the Catholic University was held Wednesday, February 18, at the Waldorf-Astoria, New York city. The president, Rev. Patrick Hayes, was in the chair. The minutes of the last meeting were read and accepted. The following officers were elected for the coming year: Rev. Patrick Hayes, of New York, president; Rev. G. J. Lucas, D.D., of Blossburg, Pa., and Rev. T. E. Shields, Ph.D., vice-presidents; Rev. William J. Higgins, of Philadelphia, secretary; Mr. William H. Kelly, of New York, treasurer; Rev. Francis P. Duffy, of New York, historian; executive committee: Rev. Dr. Wm. J. Kerby, of the University; Rev. W. A. Fletcher, D.D., of Baltimore; Rev. John T. Driscoll, of Fonda, N. Y.; Rev. John E. Bradley, of Philadelphia; Mr. C. E. Martin, of Parkersburg, W. Va.

The retiring executive committee made a report concerning the revision of the constitution. Mr. Clarence E. Martin sent to the officers of the Association copies of a new constitution which he had carefully prepared and to which he added a number of by-laws. The proposed constitution was submitted to the Association. Some amendments were offered for discussion, but final action was delayed in order to give more consideration to the various changes and additions suggested.

Father Fletcher drew the attention of the Association to the great loss the University has suffered by the death of the learned and beloved Dr. Bouquillon. On motion the president appointed Dr. Kerby, Fr. Fitzgerald and Dr. Fletcher a committee to draw up a resolution that should express the sentiments of the members in regard to the memory of the lamented Professor of Moral Theology. The committee reported:

"The Alumni Association has learned with deep regret of the death of Dr. Bouquillon. The Association pays a heartfelt tribute to the personal merit and scholarly attainment of Dr. Bouquillon and expresses to the University its sympathy in this great loss."

It was ordered that a copy of the resolution be spread upon

the minutes of the meeting and that a copy be forwarded to the Rt. Rev. Rector.

It was felt by all present at the meeting that the time had now come when the Association should give some practical illustration of its attachment to the University. Hitherto the members have been content to meet once a year to renew old friendships, to gather round the festive board, to speak of the happy hours spent at the University and to sing her praises. But according to the constitution of the Alumni Association the organization has other purposes beside these. The Association was formed not only to promote friendship among the alumni, but also to strengthen the union between the alumni and the University, and to further the interests of the University.

A very graceful means of manifesting in a substantial way the regard of the alumni for Alma Mater was brought to the notice of the meeting. It met at once the favor of all present. It was learned that Dr. Bouquillon had bequeathed his very valuable library to the University with the proviso that the University should pay \$5,000 to his heirs. The authorities of the University were thoroughly acquainted with the value of the collection which had cost the labor of a lifetime and had exercised the discriminating skill of a famous bibliophile. Permission was obtained from the trustees to borrow the money which would secure for the University a collection that cannot be duplicated, containing, as it does, many rare and costly volumes, in every way a unique contribution to the needs of the University library. On the motion of Rev. J. F. Smith the following resolution was unanimously adopted by the Association:

"Resolved, That the Alumni Association pledge itself to raise \$5,000, to present the library of Dr. Bouquillon to the University according to the terms of his will."

The president was empowered to appoint at his leisure a committee which should take measures to obtain contributions from the alumni towards the proposed fund. All who were present at the meeting are confident that there will be a willing and early response to the request of the committee, and that the Alumni Association will imitate in an humble

way the splendid example of the alumni of the American College at Rome who have recently given a most emphatic proof of their practical interest in their Alma Mater. The coöperation of every alumnus of the University will be earnestly relied upon by the Association in this its first effort to manifest its devotion to the University.

The meeting was followed by a banquet. Sincere thanks are due to the thoughtful care of the alumni of New York, whose efforts to entertain the visitors surpassed all expectation. It will be difficult in the future to eclipse the elegant hospitality displayed on that occasion. During the course of the banquet it was announced that letters of regret were received from His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, Archbishop Keane, Bishops O'Gorman and Garrigan, Drs. Dumont, Shahan, Shanahan, Aiken, Maguire, Neill, and from over fifty members of the Association. All the letters received expressed sincere attachment and loyalty to the University.

At the banquet the toasts were: "Our Holy Father," Bishop Conaty; "The Archbishop of New York," Dr. Kerby; "Our Country," Mr. Francis P. Garvan; "Our Guests," Dr. M. Cready. The distinguished speakers were heard with profound interest and they were interrupted many times by vigorous and hearty applause.

The Association was highly honored by the Most Rev. Archbishop of New York. He graciously acceded to the wish of all present by making an address. His speech will be memorable in the annals of the Association.

Most Reverend Archbishop Farley began his remarks by recalling the early history of the University idea and the welcome which he had given to it. The Church had neither organ nor institution in the United States, through which to bring to expression higher and advancing Catholic thought. This consciousness of a defect in our religious life seems to have created the University idea; it has been the support of the University ever since and to-day it is its main inspiration.

The Archbishop dwelt at length on this important function of the University, and he reminded the members of the Alumni Association that the needs of the University must be gauged by that high standard. Thus measured, those needs are great. Great must be the love and good will of the alumni, of the hierarchy, the clergy, and the

Catholic laity of the nation. The possibilities of the University, when it will be thus strengthened and supported, are magnificent.

Early trials in the University's life have not only intensified but clarified in all members the consciousness of their noble mission. Indifference and misunderstanding have, therefore, been providentially sources of great strength. The University's perpetuity is assured, the continuation of its work and its glorious success are now merely questions of detail. Much remains to be done naturally, but we know that it will be well done; the prospects of the University were never brighter. It is necessary only to work with energy, with method, to collect around the University the good will, the interest, and sympathy of the Catholics of the nation, and to perfect internal organization. We may trust to the blessing of God for success.

The Archbishop referred with much feeling to the presence of the Paulists, the Fathers of the Holy Cross, the Sulpicians, the Marists, and the Dominicans as a guarantee of the future of the University and as a prophecy of the unifying and strengthening of our Catholic life through the instrumentality of the University. He hoped that others would follow their example.

He alluded briefly but in most flattering terms to the CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY BULLETIN, its scope and the excellence of its work, and its value as a means of placing Catholic thought before the country.

Addressing the alumni, whose guest he was, he complimented them on their attachment to the University and appealed to them for constant active loyalty. They were to be the University's representatives and apostles in their life and in their work.

Concluding, the Archbishop pledged his unqualified support and sympathy to the University, and he was emphatic in his expression of his belief that an epoch of great activity and fruitful service to the Church has already been begun in the University's career. Much credit for it is due to Right Reverend Bishop Conaty, whose term as Rector is about to expire. The work, so well directed under him, will be taken up with equal energy and zeal by his successor.

As Joseph in his dream saw his brothers come and render homage to him, may we not soon see the day when all of the institutions of Catholic life in the nation, will render willing and loving homage to the University as their pride and glory. As under Joseph's direction, the granaries were filled before the years of famine, may we not hope to see the University, the great store-house of the seed of Faith, preserved against the religious and spiritual famine that seems to threaten our civilization.

Those present at the banquet were: Most Rev. John

M. Farley, D.D., Archbishop of New York; Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, Rector of the University; Very Rev. James F. Driscoll, S.T.D., St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, N. Y.; Very Rev. Edward A. Pace, S.T.D., Rev. Henry Hyvernatt, S.T.D., Rev. Dr. Wm. J. Kerby, Catholic University; Very Rev. M. W. Holland, V.F., Port Henry, N. Y.; Rev. A. P. Doyle, C.S.P., New York; Rev. Joseph H. McMahon, D.D., Rev. Chas. McCready, LL.D., Rev. M. C. Farrell, Rev. P. J. Hayes, Rev. Joseph F. Smith, Rev. Francis P. Duffy, Rev. Jno. F. Brady, Rev. William A. Courtney, Rev. Jas. J. Keane, Rev. R. B. Cushion, Rev. Thos. J. Heafy, Rev. Jas. V. Lewis, Rev. C. F. Crowley, Rev. Patrick J. Healy, Rev. Francis Colety, Rev. D. J. McMackin, D.D., Rev. Jas. P. Sheridan, Rev. Jas. F. Ferris, New York; Messrs. William H. Kelly, Francis P. Garvan, Thomas B. Lawler, John F. Duane, Rev. Joseph P. McGinley, Bay Shore, N. Y.; Rev. T. J. O'Brien, Brooklyn; Messrs. George V. Powers, Joseph G. Powers, Central Park, L. I.; Rev. Francis J. Sheehan, Rev. Michael J. M. Sorley, Rev. John E. Bradley, Rev. N. J. Higgins, Philadelphia; Rev. J. J. Loftus, Watertown, Conn.; Rev. John C. Ivers, Holyoke, Mass.; Rev. Michael Mulvihill, Marion, Ohio; Rev. J. F. Donohue, New Milford, Conn.; Rev. G. J. Lucas, D.D., Blossburg, Pa.; Rev. James J. Fox, D.D., St. Thomas College, Washington; Messrs. W. T. Jackson, Isaac L. Henson, Francis de S. Smith, Washington; Mr. D. J. Donovan, M.D., New York; Rev. John T. Driscoll Fonda, N. Y.; Mr. John W. Smith, Washington; Rev. John T. Stinson, Walden, Mass.; Rev. Matias Cuevas, University; Rev. M. G. Flannery, Far Rockaway, L. I.; Rev. Wm. J. Fitzgerald, Millville, N. J.; Rev. W. A. Fletcher, D.D., Baltimore; Rev. T. E. Shields, Ph.D., University; Rev. John Fleming, Waterbury, Conn.; Rev. Geo. F. Hickey, Milford, Ohio.

Next year the annual reunion will be held, in accordance with the constitution, in Washington.

REV. WILLIAM J. HIGGINS,
Secretary.

REV. THOMAS LEO BARRY, S.T.L.

Rev. Thomas Leo Barry, S.T.L., of the diocese of Pittsburgh, died March 14, 1903, at the early age of twenty-seven. He made his preparatory studies at the College of the Holy Ghost, Pittsburgh, and his professional course at St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, where he was ordained in June, 1899. In the fall of this same year he entered the Catholic University as a graduate student of theology and history, giving evidence from the beginning of the exceptional ability which had marked his earlier career. His dissertation for the licentiate degree, which he won with high honor in June, 1901, was a very creditable piece of work, and in his public examination for the same degree he showed a maturity of mind and judgment truly commendable.

The central problem in Christian Anthropology, that, namely, which concerns the historical development of the idea of image and likeness, was singled out by him for investigation. The work grew in interest and importance as he proceeded, and afforded so clear an outlook upon the theology of grace that he returned to the University in 1901 with the end in view of pursuing his study still further for the Doctor's degree. The better to enable him to complete a piece of work thus auspiciously begun, as well as to pay public tribute to the esteem in which he was held, he was to be made fellow in the department of dogmatic theology this year. News of his rapidly failing health came as a sad surprise to those who felt with assurance, made doubly sure by actual achievement, that his future was bright with promise.

Gentle, unpretentious, earnest and thorough in his character as in his work, he would be the first to deprecate, if living, these words, no less true because kindly, which his memory calls forth. His quiet, unobtrusive spirit was critical without being harsh, sympathetic without being effusive, judicious rather than argumentative. History furnished him with

the safest approach to old problems, and his positive character of mind found great pleasure in retracing the path of an idea down through the centuries.

Never self-assertive, he was to the members of the teaching-staff as to his fellow students on all occasions the priestly gentleman whose outward self reflected the calm of his inner life. Men of his stamp are given to force the pace of others; the battle of life is not always to the strong, nor the race to the fleet of foot, and Thomas Barry has proved that there is a momentum in the calmest of spirits where the world is least prone to look for its presence. May he rest in peace!

His funeral took place at Pittsburg, March 16, and Fathers Heverin, Crane and Grant, of the University student body, attended. On the same day a solemn Mass of requiem for the repose of his soul was celebrated in the University chapel in the presence of rector, professors and students. To his deeply grieved parents and relatives the University extends sympathy on this occasion of common loss.

NOTES AND COMMENT.

When Did St. Cæcilia Suffer Martyrdom?—Among the minor controversies of the last decade we may set down the question of the time of the death of the Roman martyr Cæcilia. It is an old controversy, but was long held to be settled by the opinion of De Rossi that she died in 177, in the reign of Marcus Aurelius. Since the death of the master, more than one of his theories has been questioned, and among them the date of 177 for the martyrdom of Cæcilia. Several archæologists have tried to locate her trial somewhere in the third century, from Septimius Severus to Valerian. One, bolder than others, has come out strongly for the reign of Julian the Apostate. Dr. Kirsch, of the University of Friburg, has for some time advocated the reign of Alexander Severus, and particularly the year 229–230. In his interesting brochure, Dr. Bianchi-Cagliesi adheres to the view of Dr. Kirsch, after expounding with clearness the dissenting opinions of other scholars. He has also collected many historical data concerning the venerable basilica that ranks among the oldest meeting-places of the Christian society, and which has lately been restored at the expense of its titular, Cardinal Rampolla. (Rome, Fr. Pustet, 1902, pp. 89.)

Female Recluses in the Middle Ages.—Our modern life, doubtless, has no place for pious souls, men and women, who might desire to shut themselves up in a small cell, close to some church or cathedral, with a window open upon the sanctuary, and another upon the church yard. Yet of such recluses there was once an abundance throughout all Catholic Europe. At its best, the purpose of this peculiar isolation was a highly mystical one—close and perpetual union with Jesus Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. They were hermits in a way, and yet not cut off from the society of the town or village. Their reputation for sanctity and the general mystical temper of the time combined often to make them the councillors of clergy and people, the depositories of secrets and even of portable wealth. In England the women-recluses were known as “Anchoresses,” as distinguished from the men known as “Anchorites.” A number of stone cells still remain in England, once affected to the use of such anchorites and anchoresses. Miss Francesca Steele has made an entertaining book out of the odds and ends of references to such persons in mediæval hagiology. There is no attempt at any

critical description and discussion of the sources for her story—the current data in dictionaries and ordinary hagiological collections are accepted. A preface by Fr. Vincent McNabb, O.P., on the theology of mysticism serves as a suitable introduction to the book. It is a pity that the scattered references to her authorities were not gathered together in a suitable bibliography—such a service is always welcome to the scholarly reader and often promotes the sale of older but excellent works, only too easily forgotten in the actual abnormal output of historical literature. (*The Anchoresses of the West*, by Francesca M. Steele (Darley Dale), St. Louis, B. Herder, 1903, 8°, pp. xix + 257.)

The Perennial Charm of Saint Francis.—It is not unnatural that a world overrun with materialism, and more deeply deceived than it likes to admit should again hark back to the “*Poverello di Cristo*,” should listen once more to the simple, sweet, original poetry of the devout Umbrian heart, in which his first disciples clothed the story of his life. Then, the irrepressible thirst for social justice and equality, the sight of strong new walls of division rising amid our changing economical conditions, added to the scientific treatment of the Romance literature and the earnest quasi-religious study of the mediæval beginnings of western art, have repopularized Saint Francis, not exactly among his own, but among a multitude of non-Catholics. In his very remarkable “*Vie de Saint Francois*” Paul Sabatier has given expression to all these neo-Protestant sympathies, and his editions of the oldest Franciscan attempts at the story of their founder have added to his merits. Unfortunately his thesis is enslaved to his hypothesis, viz., that the spirit and purpose of Francis were really anti-Roman, anti-organizational, and that violence was done him, both living and dead, by the Roman Curia, in order to stifle the germ of individual and irresponsible mysticism that was the essence of his life and ideal. Under the caption “*Sons of St. Francis*” we have a popularization of the writings and the hypotheses of the school of M. Sabatier. In spite of the loose journalistic English of the work, there are both life and color in its pages, and the author has often caught the inspiration of the peculiar conditions of the thirteenth century amid which Saint Francis arose and flourished. Perhaps the best pages are those descriptive of that “*rara avis*” among mediæval chroniclers, the gossipy, wandering, highly personal and independent Fra Salimbene of Parma. Only too often the author manifests great ignorance of the Catholic doctrine of sanctity—its history, its points of contact with society, manners, daily life, prejudices, aspirations,

ideals, states of culture, intellectual, social and economic conditions and the like. Saint Francis is no "Reformer before the Reformers," no enemy, tacit or otherwise, of the Roman Church. The fine but misdirected genius of M. Sabatier can accomplish no more than the historical erudition and insight of Uhlmann and a host of others who seek for the essence of the Lutheran revolution away from its authentic and sufficient sources and causes. (*Sons of St. Francis*, by Anne Macdonnell, New York, G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1902, 8°, pp. 436).

The Abjuration of Jeanne D'Arc.—In the course of the process of canonization of Jeanne d'Arc, the fact of her abjuration of her famous "voices" and confession of imposture, deception, superstition, blasphemy, and violation of the divine law, the Holy Scriptures and the Canons of the Church, has naturally come up for discussion. The abbé Ulysse Chevalier, in a brochure of eighty-eight pages, submits the entire "*sujet lugubre et angoissant*" to a penetrating critical examination. After a minute study of all the original texts, in their chronological order and according to their reliability, and after a careful investigation of the rules of fifteenth-century inquisitorial procedure, he concludes that the process of the "Maid" was canonically "beyond a doubt invalid and null." The act of abjuration, as now found in the documents of the process, is either a forgery or much interpolated—the witnesses agreeing at a later date that it contained only seven or eight lines, whereas the actual (French) document contains some fifty lines. M. Chevalier nevertheless maintains (p. 86) that the "Maid" was not thereby justified for her abjuration and retractation "*in extremis*." It would seem, however, from his own exposé of the physical and moral pressure brought against the wonderful girl that we are in presence of that "*metus*" which in the eyes of the Church robs an act of its "human" character, nullifies in it the element of responsibility, and reduces it to the rank of deeds performed under the blind compelling laws or instincts of nature. The study of M. Chevalier is otherwise a model of concise and objective criticism; its bibliographical notes are abundant and very useful; its judgments habitually sane and conservative. The publishers are not too bold when they say of this brochure that it is a "*régal pour les connoisseurs et une des pièces essentielles à consulter sur la vie de l'héroïne*." (*L'Abjuration de Jeanne d'Arc au cimetière de Saint Ouen et l'authenticité de sa formule*, Paris, Picard, 1902, 8°, pp. 88.)

Sources of French History.—Students of mediæval history will welcome the third fascicule of the “*Sources de l’Histoire de France*” that we owe to the learned direction of M. Molinier. In the number before us, the historians of the later Capetian dynasty (1180–1328) are treated with the same fulness and proportion that distinguish the two previous issues. Over three thousand (3,092) writers on French mediæval history are now described in this work that deserves a place in every public and private library. (Paris, Picard, 82 Rue Bonaparte, 1903.)

The Truth of Papal Claims.—Under this caption Mgr. Merry Del Val publishes the results of a controversy between himself and an Anglican clergyman at Rome in the winter of 1902. Only the more remarkable arguments for the supremacy of the Roman See are set forth, and these are drawn principally from the Christian Fathers of the first five centuries. It is difficult in a controversy to make clear the full value of these ancient texts: the adversary’s mind is usually clouded by prejudices and pre-occupations of a remote and often intangible character. Nevertheless, Mgr. Del Val has produced a good work, small in compass, but very useful for the general reader, and sufficient to illustrate the strength of the immemorial Catholic tradition. (B. Herder, St. Louis, 1902, 8°, pp. 129 + xv.)

The Civilization of the Philippines.—It is a pity that some friendly hand did not “castigate” the English style of the booklet that under the above title presents excellent considerations on the great merits of the religious orders in the civilization of the Philippines. The translators of this and similar brochures have doubtless rendered the sense of their Spanish originals—but at every page the English-speaking man must “start and stare” at the unidiomatic phraseology, improper use of prepositions, and generally foreign air of the whole page. Catholics know a priori that the labors of the orders are the true source of whatever civilization exists in the Philippines. What is now wanted is the proper presentation, in fully documented and illustrated works, of the past history of the Philippines. As it is, the truth suffers from the absence of a respectable Catholic literature in English concerning our island possessions. (Thomas J. Flynn, Boston, 1903, 8°, pp. 72.)

The Hand of God in American History.—Is there a divine Providence shaping for good our national life? Principal Thompson is firmly persuaded that such direction is visible in our history from its very beginning. In illustration of his thesis he treats philosoph-

ically the great events and the main features of our public life from the colonial period down to our own time. Naturally in the multitude of appreciations that fall from his pen as he surveys three centuries of a new and unexampled human activity, there are some from which many will dissent. His political point of view is frankly stated and vigorously defended. He is wedded to the belief in a "Scotch-Irish" national element. But, aside from minor deficiencies, his book is remarkable for elevation of sentiment, and for large Christian views of public life, wealth, equality, labor, and charity. His views on education (pp. 212-217) are very sane and correct. What he has to say (pp. 105-117) on Immigration as a factor in the upbuilding of the American state is well worth an attentive reading. Principal Thomson looks with courage and hopefulness on the future of a people which, in the past, has conquered nature and itself, has often risen to the highest human conception of justice, and responds yet to the great Christian impulses and influences that moulded its present greatness. He is impartial, as may be seen from his pages on the causes of the Mexican War and on the actual condition of the negro. He writes with much concision, yet his pages are often picturesque and always throb with feeling and the high passion of an enlightened patriotism. (T. Y. Crowell and Co., New York, 1902, 8°, pp. 235.)

Religious Liberty in Maryland and Rhode Island.—Rev. Lucian Johnston, S.T.L., offers in a pamphlet bearing this suggestive title a summary of the evidence concerning certain dissenting claims to priority in the matter of religious toleration in the New World, or rather within the actual territory of the United States. Rhode Island's foundation dates from 1636, and taking it for granted that absolute religious liberty was thenceforth the law and custom of that colony, it might seem to have priority over Maryland, which passed its famous Toleration Act in 1649. But Father Johnston maintains that the latter date cannot be taken as the beginning of religious liberty in Maryland. That colony really dates from the Avalon patent (1623), "logically and historically the beginning of Maryland." At any rate, religious toleration is already in the Charter of Maryland (1632) and in the practice of the colony since 1634. Fr. Johnston is even of opinion (p. 13) that this toleration extended to non-Christians. The method of the writer is the proper and sure one of consulting the original documents. He reads into these documents nothing of his own, at least consciously, and his interpretation of them is sustained habitually by non-Catholic writers. This presentation of an important chapter of American history de-

serves to be placed before the teachers and children of our parochial schools; it would make excellent supplementary reading for the upper classes in the history of the United States. Fr. Johnston discusses with sincerity and writes with calmness, as the following paragraph of his "Conclusion" will show:

"After this rather minute examination of the evidence, the present writer reiterates his general conclusion expressed in the beginning—to wit: that a comparison between Maryland and Rhode Island as to their priority in the establishment of religious liberty is somewhat idle. At least, it is not likely to result in changing the now generally settled convictions of the parties to the dispute. And for a reason which must be evident to the reader—namely, that the whole question revolves around an interpretation of written documents rather than the finding out of facts. We have all the facts. We disagree in their interpretation. Both parties by approaching the subject with preconceived opinions (as mostly all do, and will continue to do), can honestly interpret these facts in diametrically opposite fashions.

"The obvious question then suggests itself: Why has this paper been written? I answer, that it were well for it to have been written, if it does nothing else than present the evidence clearly, so that most readers will see the futility of a dispute which never can end as long as interpretations of that evidence will (as they must) conflict. It has served a still higher purpose if it convince a few that, after all, it is better to take a broader view of the whole affair, *i. e.*, to overlook the petty question of a few years priority, and regard both Lord Baltimore and Roger Williams as practically simultaneous forces in the movement towards religious freedom; forgiving the faults and errors of both, in view of their nobler motives; and seeking, as far as in us lies, to imitate the good they did. Such a view is nobler in itself, and infinitely more productive of sound sense and mutual good feeling."

One regrets the absence of a table of contents and an alphabetical index. Otherwise the pamphlet is a tasty and meritorious production that could easily be swelled into a very useful book—many of its brief paragraphs barely state the outlines of stirring events and measures that it were well to know in greater detail. There is always much instruction in the phraseology of the contemporary documents and literature. We hope that some day Fr. Johnston will undertake this task, if only as a labor of love. (International Catholic Truth Society, Brooklyn, 1903, 8°, pp. 56. Ten cents.)

Irish Rhode Islanders in the American Revolution.—Mr. Thomas Hamilton Murray, the efficient Secretary-General of the American-Irish Historical Society, has placed upon the future historians of the American Revolution a serious burden of gratitude, by a series of publications in which he has gathered the names of many Irishmen who served in the armies of the young republic. From the muster and size rolls of the Revolution, records of the General Assembly of Rhode Island, official war correspondence, company and regimental reports, and other authoritative sources (p. 13) he has collected the numerous facts that go to establish indubitably the share of Ireland in the glory of American Independence. Mr. Murray has not only made out a long list of Rhode Island Irishmen; he has also collected the names of many others who came from Massachusetts and New Hampshire to serve in the quota of Rhode Island. Every such contribution to the history of the upbuilding of the world's greatest republic is of value not alone to the scholars of the present, but to those of the future. It is only when a multitude of such painstaking monographs is at hand, making known and using the forgotten original sources for these special studies, that the future historians of the Revolution can allot scientifically to Ireland the merit which, in a general way, has never been honestly denied. (The American-Irish Historical Society, Providence, R. I., 1903, 8°, pp. 90.)

Early Americana of Interest.—The latest issue of the meritorious "Historical Records and Studies" of our New York Catholic Historical Society possesses more than a local interest. It contains from the pen of Dr. Benjamin F. DeCosta an account of the famous terrestrial globe of Pope Marcellus II (1555), and incidentally the proofs of the thesis that in the spring of 1524 the Catholic navigator Giovanni da Verazzano did, first of all Europeans, enter the harbor of New York and proceed some distance up the Hudson River. He was in the service of Francis II, and had sailed from Dieppe, reaching the coast of South Carolina on February 27. Very soon San Germano and the River of St. Anthony appear on maps of the New World as the first European names for the New York and the Hudson, the gay palace of Francis I and the mystic Franciscan saint as forerunners of imperial Eboracum and a London sailor. Made at Rome in 1542, perhaps under the direction of Marcellus Cervinus while yet a cardinal, this globe offers an interesting evidence of the rapidity with which discoveries in America were heralded through Europe. Another paper of absorbing interest is the scholarly résumé given by Dr. Charles George Herbermann of the cartographical discoveries of

Fr. Fischer, S.J., whereby the first known map of America (1507) has become the property of the learned world. We dare say that, in so brief a space, there is no more satisfactory account of the results attained by the new school of European cartographers who have for some time been seeking in old maps, pre-Columbian and post-Columbian, for a solution of many problems concerning the earliest American discoveries that can never be solved from purely literary sources.

THE BARONIUS SOCIETY.

The purpose of the Baronius Society is to secure annually for the Catholic University, particularly for the use of its Historical Academy, the best books on Church History, according as they are printed at home or abroad.

Every priest and every cultivated lay Catholic recognize the great need of excellent libraries, well equipped with the latest historical literature. Discussion, attack, and insinuation are more than ever carried on along the lines of history. Hence, the old theological libraries no longer furnish professors, students, and workers just the class of books they need to defend and illustrate their faith.

In the last fifty or sixty years a multitude of excellent Catholic works in every department of Church History have appeared in French, German, Italian, English, Spanish, and even other languages. Many excellent historical reviews have been founded and still continue their output of research, defence, illustration and refutation. Countless monographs have been printed on nearly every problem, institution, personality known to Church History.

New and critical editions of old ecclesiastical writers have been published both by Catholics and non-Catholics, so that it is a shame to cite antiquated texts, when scholarly editions are now accessible.

A multitude of original authorities, but little known, or hard to consult, are now before us in large collections or in separate editions. For many such works the new edition is final. All of these contain material of manifold utility for Church History, that great and final battle-field between the Church and all heresies.

Even among the works of the sixteenth, seventeenth and eighteenth centuries not a few are yet of great service to the historian for the valuable and rare documents they contain. This is notably true of the numerous historical collections owing to learned Benedictines, Jesuits, Franciscans, Dominicans and other studious orders and congregations of that time.

We are anxious to complete at once the historical collections of the past, so that there shall be at least one centrally located library in the United States where a Catholic scholar can find every book of any practical use in Church History since the invention of printing.

We are anxious to secure an annual fund that will enable us to buy every good book likely to be useful to the Catholic Church now or in the future, for the defence of her magnificent work in the civilization of Asia, Europe and America.

It is not necessary to have at once a large sum of money. A modest yearly income will represent considerable capital and enable us to order many valuable books on Church History as soon as they are printed.

This will help our theological students in the preparation of their dissertations. Often the labor of several years is left incomplete for the want of many useful new books. Our licentiate and doctor candidates feel this very keenly. They have the skill, the method, the knowledge; but the weapons and equipment are wanting. As the University is young, this is no disgrace. But it can be removed or diminished by good-will and a little self-sacrifice.

There should be at Washington a first-class library of reference for all questions pertaining to Church History. The teachers of Church History have received hundreds of letters in the past, to answer which satisfactorily required far better equipment than we then possessed, or do now.

Every year scholarly men, priests and laymen, come to do work in our libraries. With the great increase of Catholic population owing to the results of the Spanish War, scholars and legislators will welcome more and more a rich Historical Library on our grounds. The work of the Apostolate of the Mission Fathers to non-Catholics makes it desirable that all the historical collections of the University should be completed and kept up to date.

Five dollars a year entitles one to membership in the Baronius Society. No one feels the burden very heavy, and yet the collective effort produces a permanent result beneficial to all students, whether their need be that of calm research or the refutation of some belated slander. The more neatly and



scientifically the latter class of work is done, the less will be the need of returning to the task.

Those who wish to become benefactors of the Society may do so by contributing annually such larger sums as their generosity suggests or their means permit. There are many kinds of charity; the Catholic Church has always approved and honored charity exercised toward academic institutions and purposes. Such cannot appeal to the people like a diocese or a parish; they must wait till the refined and noble-hearted think of them.

An annual report will be issued, showing the moneys received from members and benefactors, also the full titles of all the books purchased therewith since the last report.

All books purchased with the funds of the Baronius Society shall be the property of the Catholic University of America, be stamped with its seal, and be accessible to all its students.

Members and benefactors will receive a copy of any publication that may be issued by the Society.

The roll of membership will be exhibited publicly in Caldwell Hall.

The students of the University will be exhorted to remember daily in their prayers all who generously contribute to the work of building up the historical department of the University Library.

All correspondence and moneys should be addressed to the treasurer of the Society, Rev. Thomas J. Shahan, D.D., Professor of Church History, Catholic University, Washington, D. C.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

The Washington Discourse.—On Tuesday, February 24, Hon. Hannis Taylor, member of the Spanish Treaty Claim Commission, and ex-Minister to Spain, delivered the annual discourse on George Washington.

Annual Spiritual Retreat.—The annual retreat was conducted this year by the Rev. Felix Ward, C.P., of the Passionist Monastery at West Hoboken, N. J.

University Celebrations.—The Faculty of Theology celebrated its annual patronal feast on January 25, the commemoration of the Conversion of Saint Paul. The Rev. Fr. Walter Elliott, C.S.P., delivered an appropriate discourse. On March 7, the Faculty of Philosophy celebrated the feast of Saint Thomas Aquinas. Rev. Dr. Maguire delivered an appropriate oration.

Portrait of Cardinal Martinelli.—A fine portrait of Cardinal Martinelli, done in oils, has been presented to the University by the artist, Mr. Thomas Eakins of Philadelphia. It is an excellent piece of work and represents the Cardinal in the street dress of his rank.

Very Rev. Dr. Grannan Member of the Biblical Commission.—Very Rev. Dr. Charles P. Grannan has received through the Papal Delegation at Washington the Pontifical Brief appointing him a member of the International Biblical Commission created by his Holiness Pope Leo XIII. The Commission which was first appointed in August, 1901, consisted originally of twelve members, one from each of the principal Catholic countries. It was subsequently discovered that the work was so extensive that the Commission originally named would be inadequate to perform the task imposed. The Commission has recently been reorganized and two Cardinals have been added to the original three; while the number of Consultors has been increased to forty members, comprising the most prominent Biblical scholars in the Church. It is a matter of sincere gratification to the University that it should have a representative in this distinguished body. For his fatherly condescension the University will always hold in grateful remembrance the person of Leo XIII.

Lectures by Dr. Pace.—In response to an invitation from the Twentieth Century Club, Dr. Pace delivered, January 24, an ad-

dress in Boston on "Moral Education." He also lectured at Bryn Mawr College, February 20, on "Medieval Views of Brain Function."

Bishop Spalding's Lecture on Education.—On Wednesday afternoon, March 18, the Right Rev. J. L. Spalding, Bishop of Peoria, and one of the trustees of the University, lectured in McMahon Hall on Education, before a very large audience. Over a thousand people representing all classes of the National Capital, greeted the distinguished prelate. The large hall was crowded to overflowing, as were also the corridors leading to the entrances. The day was beautiful and pleasant, and the distinguished audience was a tribute to one who is recognized as the foremost leader in the religious and educational life of the country. Seated on the platform with the Right Rev. Rector were his Excellency, the Papal Delegate, Most Rev. Archbishop Falconio; his secretary, Very Rev. Mgr. F. Z. Rooker, D.D.; the Mexican Ambassador, Senor Don Manuel de Azpiroz; Rev. Jerome Daugherty, S.J., president of Georgetown University; Rev. Edward X. Fink, S.J., president of Gonzaga College; Brother Abdas, president of St. John's College; Hon. John Lee Carroll, ex-Governor of Maryland; Hon. Judge Barry, of Winnepeg, Manitoba; Gen. E. C. O'Brien, of New York; Hon. Hannis Taylor, former Minister to Spain; Dr. William F. Byrns, Dr. A. J. Faust, Professor Cleveland Abbe, Hon. Terence V. Powderly, members of the different faculties of the University, and a large number of the reverend clergy from Washington. In his introduction the Rector, Right Rev. Bishop Conaty, spoke of the deep interest taken by the Bishop in university work, and described him as one of its most devoted friends, who never failed in all circumstances to manifest a vital interest in its establishment and development.

The discourse of Bishop Spalding was in every sense a masterly one, and held the attention of the distinguished audience for more than an hour.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

VOL. X.

JULY, 1903.

No. 3.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. IX.

July, 1903.

No. 3.

ON THE ITALIAN RENAISSANCE.

By the word "Renaissance" is usually meant that period of mediæval history in which the ideas, tastes, artistic principles, and the political spirit of Græco-Roman or pagan antiquity for the first time asserted themselves in Christian society, and finally, to a greater or lesser extent, prevailed and affected the development of all Christian peoples. The time, roughly speaking, is the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—though the glorious and typical period really comes to an end with the death of Pope Leo the Tenth, and the careers of Raphael and Michael Angelo. In something less than one hundred years there occurred, chiefly in Italy, a vigorous advance in all that pertained to classical learning and the fine arts. First the Latin and then the Greek authors of antiquity were either discovered for the first time, or studied and appreciated from a new point of view. The best manuscript copies of them were sought out with avidity. Popes and kings, bishops and rich individuals, kept great scholars travelling in all directions for such literary treasures. An unknown work of Cicero, or a fragment of Tacitus, was hailed with scarcely less enthusiasm than the discovery of America. The conflict of the great popes of Rome and the emperors of Germany, the political failure of the Crusades, the increase of the city populations, and the growth of new cities, the perfection of social intercourse, the rise of great banking houses, the in-

creased value of arable lands, the growing trade of Venice and Genoa and Florence with the Orient—the only immediate result of the Crusades—were so many remote causes of this revival, which is less a sudden outgrowth than a natural development of the Middle Ages.

Then, the popes had come back to Rome at the opening of this period. The unhappy schisms that were rending Europe before the rival claims of three or four bishops to the See of Rome had been finally settled at the Council of Constance (1418) to the content of Christendom, and that pontifical unity restored which has now lasted for five hundred years. Rome was again a center of government, and the papacy again a Roman institution. It was no longer in the hands of one nation, France, nor dominated by the interests of that one people. Italy itself had gradually emerged from the political anarchy of the fourteenth century into a certain unity. Five great states were solidly established on the Italian peninsula and held a balance of power that was not disturbed with success until the end of the fifteenth century, when the municipal revolutions of Florence opened to France, Spain, and Austria the road of successive domination over the peoples of Italy. To these five states—Naples, Venice, Florence, Milan, and Rome—were subject a multitude of smaller cities and principalities, in greater or lesser degree, with more or less acquiescence. Some of these states were quite feudal and aristocratic, others quite popular and democratic. Still, the land was administered with a certain regularity of system. The prosperity of Italy was perhaps never greater; there were wars and sieges and revolutions—but they were seldom bloody. The Italians themselves are now traders and farmers. The wars are carried on by wandering bands of hired ruffians from Germany and England and France—the famous Condottieri, whose aim is always to save their own carcasses and extort the last penny from their employers. Nearly everywhere the old popular liberties have lost their meaning, the popular constitutions have ceased to operate, and the political power is held by some bold and resourceful man. Liberty had mostly been be-

gotten in turbulence and disorder—when the period of parturition was over the masses sank exhausted to the level of mere enjoyment. In the Italian city-states henceforth it is the age of the “tyrants,” the “despots,” very much like certain periods of old Greek history, when the richest merchant in the state seized on the reins of authority, slew or exiled or imprisoned the heads of factions, imposed his will on the people, gave them peace and comfort, and put the revenues in his own treasury. Italy was dominated by these men—the Medici in Florence, the Farnesi at Naples, the Visconti and Sforza at Milan, the Baglioni at Perugia, the Malatesta at Rimini, and a host of smaller but no less masterful men, no less quick watchful and resolute. They were nearly all new men, either scions of the smaller nobility, or daring spirits from the lower strata of Italian life. None of them inherited his power. Each one got it by some deed of violence or cunning, some great personal act of intelligent political boldness or “virtù” that command universal attention and admiration. Of course, he held his standing, his “stato” by the same policy. To such men the classical revival, particularly the Latin, became an instrument of government. The native Latin scholars got employment and salaries and distinction from them. It came about that an Italian man could advance more quickly with a Latin speech of Ciceronian elegance, or a mouthful of sharp and pungent epigrams, than with a big warhorse and a coat of mail. Moreover, all this was in the history and manners of the people of Italy, whose soil had been for centuries the “dancing-field of Mars,” the “dark and bloody ground” of Europe. The centers of government were no longer the lonely castles or cloud-kissing burgs of the Apennines or the Abruzzi. The hard and unlovely feudal rule of Colonna and Orsini, of Frangipani and Conti, was over with the Gregories and the Innocents, the Henrys and the Fredericks. Italy was now governed as of old, from her cultured cities. She still knew only a government by *imperium*, but it was now to be exercised with the moderation born of *humanitas*. The stern mediæval fortress was abandoned with its moat and its drawbridge, and the house of the despot, the very spot where he

had risen to greatness, was enlarged, beautified, and made the seat of government. Enough big Germans and Englishmen, adventurers and semi-outlaws of all Europe, were kept on hand to overawe the unruly elements of the population, to form a bodyguard for the despot, but the palace was given over practically to the enjoyment of life—to the recitation of poems and tales of chivalry, to musical and theatrical entertainments, to every kind of amusement that could beguile the uncertain leisure of the master and his numerous household, or distract the wealthy and the influential from meditation on the gilded slavery into which they had fallen. The despot's position was by no means secure from revenge, envy, or popular whim. Now and then velleities, vague souvenirs of liberty, awoke faintly in the heart of some exalted youth, or romantically transfigured reminiscences of popular freedom stirred up some belated Rienzi. But the Italian peoples were now prosperous in peace, and all such fruitless efforts stand out as proofs of the general contentment with the political situation. The republican spirit was dead, and the peninsula was moving through despotism and oligarchy to its final monarchical constitution.

The last century was the great epoch of inventions. They crowd one another so fast; we are so near them, so in the midst of the far-reaching social changes they are imposing on us, that we can not yet appreciate with finality their importance. So it was in the fifteenth century with practical politics. Events of the greatest interest for the world followed with startling rapidity on one another—the healing of the great Schism of the West (1418), the Fall of Constantinople (1453), the growth of Venice as queen of the seas, the natural ambition of regenerated France to pose as political mistress of Europe, the simultaneous creation of a splendid Spanish monarchy that dominated Germany, Austria, Italy, and the Netherlands, and undertook to dispute those claims of France on a hundred bloody fields. On all sides human interest, curiosity, energy, were aroused. Infinite opportunities arose, even before the discovery of America. Man came almost at once to know himself as the source of the greatest things, to look on him-

self as capable of infinite progress in any direction. After the long mediæval era of collectivism an era of individualism had set in, and the Italian man was the best equipped for the new order of things. His experience, bought in blood and tears, in a multitudinous wrestling of several centuries, was his title to preëminency. A long series of historical events was behind him, during which all the great factors of European life had arisen, developed and conflicted with one another. It was an hour, if ever, for the philosopher of history, and he was at hand. It was in this Italian political world, at once old and new—old with the religious heart and experience, the faith and the family life of the Middle Ages; new with all the prophetic stirrings and impulses of the future—that Latin and Greek learning, the poets, philosophers and historians of pagan antiquity, found the nation of disciples best fitted for them. The Italian tongue is the Latin tongue of the common people, peasantry, and soldiers of old Rome, only modified by contact with the Teutonic dialects and filled with a new Christian content and spirit through contact with Catholicism. So the Latin classics, as they came back into daily life with Petrarch and Boccaccio and their nameless contemporaries, with Valla and Poggio and so many others, awoke from their secular sleep, as it were in their own family circle. Their spirit and their ideals of life and man, their vague or negative teaching about the soul and the future, their amorphous notions of God, righteousness, sin and evil, their cold cynicism and ruinous agnosticism, their ineffable obscenity and their cringing adulation of force and success, their hopeless moral debasement and their refined intellectualism—all these things came back with them and appealed to the rising generation of Italians with a siren voice. Literature was always their national weakness, and the sources and agencies of it—schools, books, writing—were always better preserved in Italy than elsewhere. The monuments of Roman grandeur were there; her cities never forgot that they were the homes of the great poets; Mantua boasted of Vergil's birth, and Naples of possessing his tomb; Padua was proud of her historian Livy, and Tibur of her satirist Horace. It was the first thing that

the children in the schools learned and the last thing that the aged citizens forgot. All through the fifteenth century went on a constant excavation of the soil on the sites of these ancient cities, with the result that thousands of marble statues were found, the best work of a multitude of those Greek sculptors of the early empire who repeated for their imperial masters, at Rhodes or elsewhere on the coast of Asia Minor, the masterpieces of the glorious art of their Hellenic fatherland. The Law of Rome, that perfect mirror of the genius of the Eternal City, had for four hundred years been the constant study of Italians, both laymen and clerics, and thereby they had risen to eminence, not only at home, but in every land of Europe. Its spirit of absolutism, its enticing suggestions and examples of administrative centralization, its large and luminous principles, its appeals to human reason and the common experience of mankind, its temper of finality and practical infallibility, made it the great working code of the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries—likewise the sepulchre of mediæval liberties and independence.

This universal Italian interest, as commentators and expounders of an old national system of law and order, naturally developed much intellectual liberty. A lawyer is notoriously useless if he cannot see at least one other side to every question that can arise. And there were many of them in contemporary Italy who had been long accustomed like Hudibras, to

“Distinguish and divide

A hair 'twixt south and southwest side.”

Then, too, the layman had never been so ignorant in Italy as in Germany and England. Not only was the career of the law always open to him, but also that of schoolmaster, of notary, of tutor—and the noble and rich youth of Italy was always brought up by tutors. Vettorino da Feltre and Guarino da Verona were only excellent in a multitude of lay teachers of the quattrocento. The man of Italy was architect, artist, jurist, traveller, merchant—in a word, just as the bishops of Italy dominate less in the political life of the nation than those of Germany or England, so there was in every city and

town a clear-headed and self-conscious percentage of laymen, highly educated for the time, and persuaded that they were the representatives of the majesty of ancient Rome. Their hearts and minds were of course like wax for the new movement toward a revival of the times in which their forefathers had governed all civilized humanity.

These elements alone would have sufficed to create a Renaissance of learning on the soil of Italy. And, indeed, it was far advanced when Greek scholarship came to its aid, and gave it a powerful impulse and a logical basis. As a matter of fact the poetry philosophy and art of Rome were originally borrowed from the Greeks. The Roman, left to himself, was a shrewd farmer, a patient obedient soldier, a painstaking lawyer. Farther afield in the world of the mind, the Catos and Scipios never went—in fact, they scented a grave danger in the absolute intellectualism of Greece as soon as it rose above their social horizon. But the fine mind of Greece was too beautiful—and beauty has always an hour of victory—to be kept out of the Roman City. And so from Ennius to Vergil, it was the schoolmistress of the heavy rustic Latin, a tongue of fields and cows, of beans and peas and fodder, of rough policemen and dickering peddlers. The Roman knew that his soul had no wings, but he bore the veiled sarcasm of his Athenian or Corinthian teacher for love of the graceful forms into which he was soon able to cast his thoughts, the very ones that he had borrowed from the gifted children of Hellas. He had destroyed their archaic autonomy, he had laid waste their small but marvellous state—this was their revenge, that in the hour of gross material triumph the spirit of Rome prostrated itself before the spirit of Greece and divided with the latter the hegemony of mankind.

And so, in the latter half of the fifteenth century, when that splendid seat of Greek life and thought, Constantinople, was unhappily lost to Christendom, there was an exodus, a flight of its learned proletariat, the gifted and needy but often unprincipled and immoral scholars of the Christian Orient. From the Golden Horn and the Greek cities of Asia Minor they came in great numbers to Italy. Every city of the peninsula

welcomed them, every little court invited them. Only, Florence, the City of the Golden Lilies, was especially generous. Here a great family of merchant-princes and bankers, the Medici, had long been absorbing, by a complicated system of accounts, the political authority, long been debasing the democratic spirit of the once rude and proud commonwealth by the Arno. Cosimo de' Medici, and his grandson Lorenzo the Magnificent, were among the extraordinary men of history—self-willed, working now by cunning, now by violence, gifted with a clear untroubled vision of their aims and the practical means to attain them, rich beyond past example, judiciously prodigal, cautious and certain in their deliberate enslavement of the Florentine. In and through the Medici, themselves enriched democrats, the democracies of northern Italy finally fell a prey to the new monarchies that it took a Napoleon to overthrow. But if they were enemies of the popular liberties, the Medici were the patrons of letters and arts. Their money flowed like water for manuscripts of the Greek and Latin classics, for museums and galleries where all the curiosities of antiquity were gathered, for collections of coins and medals, for every bit of skilled handiwork—engravings, bronzes, marbles, ivories, miniatures, intaglios, jewels—for all that was rich, rare, and beautiful. Under their protection the learning and poetry of Greece were made known again to Italy after an estrangement of twelve centuries. Aristotle was taught, but not the barbarous Aristotle of the schools—he was now read in the original texts. Above all, Plato was set up as the true master of the mind, the one man who held the secrets of existence both here and hereafter. His magisterium was unquestioned, his mellifluous sentences were held the very breathing of divinity. His highly spiritual philosophy drove out from the schools the exact and severe logic of the Stagirite. At the same time its vague and uncertain idealism ate in like a cancer upon the stern moral conceptions of life, duty, sin, judgment, that were essential to Christianity. For severity of principles there were set up serenity, placidity of soul, equableness and moderation of views, a large and calm tolerance of all opinions, based on the assumption that there was nothing

in the realm of thought but opinions, and that the correct thing was to have only such as were lovely and beautiful.

The doctrines of Plato are, indeed, reconcilable with Christianity, which can always find some truth, some utility in every human philosophy. This reconciliation was once executed by the Christian fathers—Saints Gregory of Nazianzum and Gregory of Nyssa, Saint Basil the Great, Saint John Chrysostom, and others, men of sincere and enlightened faith. It could not be repeated by the Byzantine Greeks of the Renaissance, who were only too often infidels at heart, scandalized by the success of Mohammed, and still oftener libertines in conduct and principle. Nevertheless, a holy and learned cardinal like Bessarion, a mystic gentle priest like Marsilio Ficino, and a multitude of men like them, did believe that the divine Plato was as another Messiah, and that his refined and superior naturalism could somehow be the bridge over which the modern world would go into the fold of Jesus Christ. It was an excusable error, but a profound error, and its influence on all after civilization of Europe has been incalculable.

All these new influences were intimately related to the *primum mobile* of Italian life—the fine arts. Architecture, painting, sculpture and music, were true educators at all times of the Italian soul, very susceptible and plastic, particularly open to external influences. In this the Italians differed little from other peoples who live beneath a cloudless sky, in a land of perpetual sunshine, amid the charms of a bounteous and smiling nature.

Italy had never heartily adopted the Gothic architecture. The soft and even climate called for broad open and light-some spaces, while the clear and cultivated genius of the people was opposed to the dim uncertain lines and the semi-darkness of the Northern Gothic. They adopted, indeed, such details as were compatible with florid ornamentation—the pointed arch, the window of colored glass. But the so-called Gothic churches of Italy are always more Romanesque than Gothic, seldom if ever the nicely poised and balanced framework that rises like a perfect problem in calculus. Even these small concessions to the mediæval spirit were soon withdrawn.

The architecture of the Italian Renaissance becomes frankly pagan. The unfinished churches of their Middle Ages, and they were many, are often completed after the style of a pagan temple. Everywhere there is absolute symmetry of level lines, cold unrelieved plain surfaces, perfect proportions of columns and stories—a bookish architecture with little or no free-ranging personality. Who are now the builders? It is no longer the strong spiritual bishop rousing his people to raise before the world a fitting temple for the God of all natural beauty. It is the merchant who builds a small but perfect palace within a reasonable time, the despot who enlarges his modest shop and converts a square or two into a fortified but elegant camp, the brigand who calls on the scholar to make his stony crags impregnable, the epicure who retires from a jarring and rude-mannered world to enjoy a life of natural comfort in an elegant villa amid flowers and birds and sunshine, in the company of cultured men and women. Italian humanity, in its upper classes, is disenchanted of the great mediæval spell of vigorous expanding proselytizing Catholicism, and the new temper is shown at once in the new architecture that is of the earth earthy. It is not a little striking that the noble treatise of the Roman Vitruvius on architecture should have been discovered and edited by Poggio, one of the most immoral men of the Renaissance. This new architecture lends itself everywhere to richness and elegance, in the decoration of doors and windows, in the objects of furniture. Everywhere the ornaments of antiquity return to use—the egg and dart, the scroll, the trailing vine, the scenes of the harvest. The churches are vast galleries of pretty and tempting art-works, repetitions of the salons of the nobles. The bell-towers of the Middle Ages, picturesque and rugged, disappear; the exterior walls of the churches are white or yellow-washed. Most of the traces of the mediæval life and spirit vanish—as a rule of course unconsciously. It was a new spirit, a new atmosphere that was abroad. Architecture became a thing of the schools, a science of rules and precepts as solemn as the laws of the Medes and Persians. This was largely the work of the Latin and Greek scholars, the men known as Humanists, from the

word *Humanitas* or *Humaniores literæ*, meaning civilization, refined literature and the like. It was an unfortunate thing that deep in the hearts of many of these men there reigned a positive antipathy to the ideals and tenets of Christianity—hence all its peculiar monuments must be decried. New ideas must have a new setting, or rather, the old ideas must be clothed again in the old forms.

We must not believe that all this love of classical learning, this devotion to the fine arts, was a sudden growth. The splendid works of the fifteenth century in painting and sculpture were no more a sudden blossoming than the architecture of the period. Since the time of Giotto and the Pisani, the observation of nature and the perfection of technical skill in drawing, coloring, draping, landscape, decorative ornament, had been growing. There were regular schools for all the arts, notably the workshops of such wonderful Italian cathedrals as Pisa and Orvieto and Florence that were never quite finished—so vast were the ideas of their builders. We know now that the Italian painters had been learning much from the artists of Flanders and Burgundy—the handling of light and shade, the art of painting in oils—a revolution that threw out of daily or domestic use the fresco and the painting on wood, and made popular the canvas painting. Engraving on wood and copper multiplied the best work and enriched the artist. The painter is now as intensely popular as once the singer of love and war. He is yet a plain man of the people and bears always a popular name, often a nickname. No matter what his subjects are, he introduces the local landscape, let us say of Tuscany or Umbria, the local personages and customs. In the human figure the old conventionalism disappears and the portrait takes its place—in a word, we have a Christian realism in painting. At Siena there lives on a remnant of the deeply pious old school, the school of calm and serene adoration and contemplation that has left us the sweet evangel of San Gimignano. But throughout Tuscany, beginning with Florence, it is different. Living portraits, domestic landscapes, local traits of daily life, real houses and castles, unique and lovely ornaments based on flowers of the field and the lines of nature

herself—the individual experiences of the painter—are in every picture. The prophets lose their nimbus or halo, the apostles are figures of men on the street, the women are the mothers, sisters, sweethearts of the painters. Some few traces of that stern law of early Christian painting that fixed every type and made it obligatory live on. Thus, the Last Supper, the Madonna and Child, for the composition and disposition of figures, are the same as you may see in the Catacombs at Rome. But Leonardo da Vinci is said to have walked the streets of Milan for ten years looking for a suitable Head of Christ to put in his great masterpiece. The living model came into use—it would have been an abomination to the severely moral and mystic soul of the mediæval painter. Painting was, indeed, yet in the service of the Church. But it was seeking new objects, ancient history and pagan mythology. Here came in the influence of the book-men, the Greek and Latin scholars. Through them the painting, or rather the sculpture and architecture of antiquity, revived and were cultivated. They lectured on the beauty of them, praised every new find, wrote daily on the absolute inimitable perfection of what the Greeks and Romans did, said, and were. Consciously or unconsciously those teachers, whether in university hall or city market-place, or in the palaces of the nobles, perverted the simple genuine Christian life of many an Italian town. The thousand years of the Middle Ages became a long dismal blank—its monuments like its writings were to their mind without true style, without perfection of form, therefore bad and worthy of eternal oblivion.

Of course, the local domestic origin of much Italian painting kept up always the religious life. A multitude of the noblest works of the great masters of the fifteenth and even the sixteenth centuries was produced for village confraternities—banners, altar-pieces; another multitude was made for individuals. Every lady wanted a Madonna in her little oratory, and it must be by the best painter of the time. The workshop of a Perugino or a Raphael was crowded with orders from all Italy. Raphael is said to have painted with his own hand, or designed and begun, nearly three hundred Madonnas.

Every family of importance had an altar in the parish church or in some church of the monks or friars, and it had to be decorated by the finest talent they could secure. Then there were the "Laudi," the village processions, and the "Mysteries"—the real origin of our theatres. All their forms of outdoor life called for images, painted compositions, and the most famous painter did not disdain the gold pieces that he got from humble village-folk for these designs. The intense rivalry of popular Italian life compelled him to produce something new and lovely each time, and in this way furthered constantly the perfection of such work.

Thus, the natural genius, the climate, the history, the monuments of antiquity, the language of the Italians, and their unbroken residence on the soil since the remotest times—all conspired to create an incredible number of the loveliest works of art, and to make Italy one great gallery of the fine arts.

In the fifteenth century were finished, to a great extent, the buildings begun in the thirteenth. Milan, Orvieto, Siena, Pisa, gave the new classical temper a chance to overshadow the spirit of the Middle Ages in façades, windows, decoration and sculpture that consciously depart from the spiritual beliefs and ideals of the men who planned and partly executed these great works. The new skill in drawing, both outline and perspective, and in foreshortening, permitted a more grandiose kind of frescoing. And when the scholars of Squarcione at Padua, like Andrea Mantegna, were given such a work as the T palace of Mantua to build, they reproduced antiquity along every line as far as they were able. They did not have it all their own way—a Fra Angelico and a Fra Bartolommeo, and many another famous painter, still clung to the inward and ideal spiritual beauty, the expression in each face of tender sentiments of piety, divine adoration, love, humility, gratitude. After the great triumphs of the fifteenth century the genuinely Christian sculptor grew rarer, driven out of business by the glorious models of antique art that were being daily dug up, and by the popular admiration for these models that sinned in many ways against the delicacy of the Christian conscience. When finally the old Saint Peter's was thrown down and the vast modern basilica

was planned and begun, the genuine Christian architecture, and with it of course the other arts, suffered a humiliation from which they are only beginning to recover.

A curious feature of the Italian Renaissance is the fact that many of its painters sculptors and architects were goldsmiths or apprentices of goldsmiths. The Italian goldsmith of the time was in reality, very often, the chief man of science in the town. We must remember that there was as yet no sharp distinction in artistic work—the true artist was able to turn his hand to sculpture as well as painting, to engraving on copper as well as to writing down the principles and practice of all these arts. So the goldsmith had to know many secrets of chemistry and the treatment of the precious metals, he had to be an architect for designing of reliquaries and an engraver for the inscriptions and fine ornamentation, a worker in mosaic and therefore a painter; a good ironsmith too, for he often had orders of a bulky nature. His shop, like the traditional shoemaker's shop, was the rendezvous of the chief citizens; his lovely masterpieces were on their tables and in their halls.

So a Verrocchio, a Pollajuolo, a Ghirlandajo, a Francia, were either apprentices of goldsmiths or goldsmiths themselves. It is also of some interest to know that most of the great artists of the fifteenth century were of poor and humble origin. It is a significant commentary on the truism that the real goods of life are not moneys, lands, revenues, but the fruits of the mind and the heart—education and religion. Who knows or who cares, except some dustman or scavenger of history, about the rich bankers of Augsburg, the wool merchants of Florence, the public carriers of Venice? With their wealth they wrote a line upon the sands of time that the next wave obliterated. But the names of the great artists shine forever in their masterpieces and echo forever above the great procession of humanity. Their very names to-day are a golden mine for Italy, since from every quarter of the world they draw thither an increasing multitude of men and women. Giotto was a shepherd, and like him Andrea Mantegna tended sheep. Fra Bartolommeo was the son of a carter. Leonardo da Vinci,

Brunellesco, and Michael Angelo were the sons of humble officials. They were all, or nearly all, poorly enough paid, and much less esteemed than the pompous Latinists and Grecists who got all that was going in the shape of fat offices, ambassadorships, public junketings and the like. Society usually gets what it pays for—in those days it admired too much the fine forms of antiquity, that were as empty then as now of any deep moral value, and it got in return fine words and elegant rhetoric. But these were very hollow things and failed to preserve the popular liberties of the Italian republics that were as solid as a rock so long as the people held to their mediæval ideals. While the people of Florence, for example, went off in pursuit of mere earthly beauty, in language and color and form, the chains of a long slavery were being forged against their awakening. With his banquets and his songs, his wit and his lasciviousness, his manuscripts and his jewels, Lorenzo led the people out of their mediæval roughness and rawness. But when these *noctes cænæque deûm* were over, came the dawn of a cruel and debasing slavery.

After all, Florence is the typical city of the Italian Renaissance. It is true that many of her greatest artists worked for the popes at Rome, and that Saint Peter's and the Vatican are only too thoroughly Renaissance work. It is true that a multitude of Roman churches owe their erection or their present form and ornament to this period. It is also true that government and administration were highly colored in that city by the ideals and the temper of the Renaissance. But, when all is said, it remains true that the City of Rome is primarily a mediæval city, and only in a secondary way a city of the Renaissance. Its art is at Rome an importation, the citizens do not give their children to it, it has nowhere a common popular character. There is no wild surging of the masses to look at the last masterpiece of Donatello, no submission of superb plans and designs to the taste of the mob. Thus, while the Eternal City wears the livery of the Renaissance, it is nowise true that it was the *foyer*, the living center of its influence. That was always Florence. There the slowly rising cathedral, the baptistery, the bronze doors of Ghiberti, the pri-

vate fortress-palaces of the Pitti, the Strozzi, the Rucellai, the statues of San Giorgio, the masterpieces of the Loggia, the Greek philosophers and infidels, the Latin orators and critics, the gabby farceurs, the della Robbia, a Filippo Lippi, a Benozzo Gozzoli, a Domenico Ghirlandajo, are all contemporary, all at home beneath a sky and amid a nature that seemingly are made for them. For us moderns they have been made to live again by John Addington Symonds, by Perrens, Villari, Monnier, and by the incomparable "vision" of George Eliot. Rome, Naples, Milan, Venice, and countless minor cities, have each their immortal works, their glorious names that enthuse from generation to generation all lovers of the beautiful. Each of these cities has its own significance in the history of the human mind in the West. Each was in its way a schoolroom of our education. But Florence is the great university of the Renaissance, where its materials are piled up, where its professors were trained, where its lessons were long and regularly taught, where its philosophy worked out most easily all its purposes and problems. Here, above all, its spirit was always at home, a supreme and masterful spirit of free affectionate surrender to the claims of beauty, regardless of truth and morality, as though beauty were to itself a higher law and its service some unshackled esoteric form of religion, sole worthy of the chosen spirits to whom are revealed its infinite grace proportion and harmony. Here, long before Luther and Calvin, was reached the real parting of the ways, the Pythagorean letter of crucial import, the conscious divorce of the senses and the soul, with a rigid resolution to walk in the chosen path whithersoever it finally led.

Already the soul of Christian Italy was called on to accept the noted formula: *Amicus quidem Plato, sed magis amica veritas*. It is a long cry from Pius II (Aeneas Silvius) to Saint Pius V, but in that fateful century there went on such a fierce and relentless probing of hearts and consciences throughout the peninsula as had never been seen since the days of Augustus. Unexpectedly men came upon the scene who hewed judgment to the line and hung the plummet of righteousness. And when their work was done the astonished

world confessed that there was yet a heart of oak in the old mediæval burg of Catholicism, that it could rise, stern and uncompromising, from an hour of dalliance and indolence, that it was not unworthy of its immemorial right of leadership, that it was able to cope as successfully with the insidious revival of the paganism of Libanius and Symmachus as it had with the paganism of Frederick II, that it knew itself always for the living responsible conscience of Catholicism which had never yet implored from it in vain the key-note of harmony or the bugle-call of resistance unto death, and that with native directness it saw far and clearly into the nature and course of the incredible revolution that was sweeping away all Northern Europe.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

THE COMPARATIVE METHOD IN LITERATURE.

Of all critics, Voltaire was the narrowest and most incapable of appreciating the methods of comparative literature. He was almost ready to say, with LeClerc—"The English have many good books; it is a pity that the authors of that country can write only in their own language." And yet narrow, even to classical bigotry, as he was, regarding all literature that was not a French imitation of Greece and Rome, he admits the continuity, the relativity, the world-wide power of literature when he says—"There are books that are like the fire on our hearths—we take a spark of this fire from our neighbors, we light our own with it; its warmth is communicated to others, and it belongs to all."

The business of the student of literature is to trace the pedigrees of books, as well as to compare books with books. And this comparison, this power of tracing implies in its result both concentration and expansion. Every book has its pedigree; and the ancestors of books, like the ancestors of persons, cannot be uprooted from the soil in which they grew; they are of their climate, of their time. As the bit of tapestry from a far-off Turkish palace carries the scent of the attar of roses to distant lands and through many changing years, so the book—one of a line of books—mingles with the current of thought, long after it is forgotten, in the life of an alien nation. Joseph Texte, in his "*Etudes de Littérature Européenne*," says: "A literature no more than an animal organism grows isolated from neighboring nations and literatures. The study of a living being is in a great part the study of the influences which unite it to beings near it and of the influences of all species which surround us like an invisible net-work. There is no literature," he continues, "and perhaps no writer, of whom it can be said that the history confines itself within the limits of his own country. How can the evolution of German literature be understood, without knowing the reasons for the acceptance on the part of German writers of the French influence, and

then of its rejection for the English influence? The history of the influence of Shakespere in Europe would, of itself, be an essential chapter in the history of modern literature. Romanticism is primarily an international event, which can be explained, as George Brandes says, only by the inter-relations of various literatures." The sentimental romanticism of Goethe, as evident in "The Sorrows of Werther," is due to the same influence that made "La Nouvelle Héloïse" of Rousseau, and made Sterne's "The Sentimental Journey"; but before Rousseau we find that other sentimentalist, the Abbé Prevost, whose book, "Manon Lescaut," was the predecessor of "Paul and Virginia." Voltaire, as everybody knows, owed much of his worst quality to the English Bolingbroke. In his serious works we find English Deism served with the *esprit Gaulois*; in the others where wit and bitter cynicism play like infernal lightning, we find Rabelais changed, and yet the same. "It seems, finally," to quote from Joseph Texte again, "that the literature of the modern epoch—and perhaps of all epochs—neither develops nor progresses without imitating or borrowing: imitation of antique, as in France, in the seventeenth century—borrowing from neighboring literatures, as in Germany, in the eighteenth. It is necessary, in order to make original works germinate, to prepare the soil with the *débris* of other works."

The student of literature, then, ought not to attempt to take one book and isolate it from its fellows. The beauty and freshness and humor of Chaucer may be enjoyed whether we go back to the trouvères for the sources of his earlier works, or trace the effects of Dante and Petrarch on those later in life; but for the broadening of the mind, for the perception of that sense of continuity so necessary for the knowledge of God's guidance in history, for the value of literature as a method of discovering the meaning of laws, it is well that Chaucer should be studied as a link in a chain. And yet not only as a link in a chain, but as a link in a chain running, as it were, through a closely knit coat of mail, touching and binding a hundred other links, large and small, without which the glittering garment of knighthood would be incomplete.

It deepens pleasure to know the relations of books to one another. It makes the study of literature easier, for it softens that feeling of desperation which strikes the reader when he enters a teeming library. Where shall he begin? How shall he hew a line through this wilderness of books? The genealogy of the book he loves will help him to do this, and its posterity will further assist in the work. Further to put the study of the pedigrees of books on higher ground, who speaks the word comparison, with the object of discovering truths, speaks the word science. "If the history of literature," as Joseph Texte remarks, "does not constitute an end in itself, if it aims, like all researches worthy of the name of science, at certain results which are at present beyond it, if it assumes, in fine, to be a form of the psychology of races and men, the comparative method imposes upon it the necessity of regarding the study of one type of men or of one literature as only an approach to a study more worthy to be called scientific."

There are many reasons, then, why books should be studied comparatively. The mere investigation as to whether one book is an imitation of another is not so important or vital as the analysis of beauties that have stimulated greater beauties in another book. No reader will say that Plutarch and Shakespere resemble each other. The Greek was a prose narrator, greatest in his way; the Englishman was a dramatic poet, greatest in his way; and yet the influence of Plutarch on "Julius Cæsar" and "Coriolanus" is unmistakable. It is as plain as the influence of the Byzantines on Giotto, or that of Wagner on the later manner of Verdi, or of Pindar on the English ode of the eighteenth century. Mangan and Poe seem to have no close relationship. As a rule, we do not think of them together, and yet it is difficult, after reading these poets, who evidently held peculiar and sensuous theories about poetry, to believe that Poe did not conscientiously imitate Mangan. And the German influences on Mangan are easily traced. How much Gælic meters affected him, it is not, unfortunately, possible for me to say.

To return to Shakspere: I once asked a friend of mine who loved only a few books, why he kept the maxims of Epic-

tetus, the Roman slave, so near the plays of Shakspeare, who was more than any Roman patrician. He simply turned to a line out of Hamlet: "For there is nothing either good or bad, but thinking makes it so." "That is from Epictetus," he said, "and the more I study Shakspeare's philosophy, the more I find Epictetus." And so the little volume held its place beside the many books of Shakspeare's plays, and further examination convinced me that it had reason to be there.

Emerson, to come from the reign of Nero and Elizabeth to our own time, owes much to Epictetus, but more to Plato and Montaigne. He was not an imitator but an assimilator; to his philosophy we owe little, but to his power of stimulating idealism much. Emerson reflects Plato and Montaigne and his New England skies at the same time. His Plato is not the Plato of the groves and the white temples, but Plato touched by the utilitarianism of the cotton factory; his Montaigne is not the gay and polite and witty and pensive Montaigne, content with his books and his Burgundy, but a restless Montaigne, frost-bitten by Puritanism, become oracular because his auditors were too busy to contradict him.

If you compare the four essays on "Friendship"—Cicero's, Montaigne's, Bacon's, Emerson's, you will find the man Emerson, surrounded and affected by the shades of his literary ancestors. If you examine his bumps, after the manner of the discredited practices of phrenology, you will find that they are all of the American type; but you will find, too, that the influences of his literary ancestors has, in its old-worldly way, corrected the indications which the bumps show. He is composite; and the study of the types that enter into his make up will give a clue to the methods that ought to be used in the comparative study of other authors, who are all composite.

Voltaire says that nearly everything in literature is the result of imitation. But Voltaire was as deficient in desire and the power of real comparison as any of the Romans or Greeks. He was the slave of conventions; and was almost as rigid as that literary *sans culotte* who, in 1794, refused to save a victim from the guillotine because his petition had not been put into

classical language. If Voltaire has said that everything great in literature is largely the result of assimilation, he would have been much nearer the truth. There are those who call Tennyson classical, in the sense of coldness and symmetry; yet it can be easily shown that one of his most influential literary ancestors was Byron, who can be called neither cold nor classical. In fact, if any poet is romantic—and sentimentally romantic—Byron is that poet. In “Locksley Hall” and “Maud,” there is the Byronic note, without the depths of Byronic despair. Tennyson’s hopes and ideals are infinitely higher than Byron’s in the first part of “Locksley Hall,” and the passion infinitely purer in “Maud.” In the second part of “Locksley Hall” the impetuous boy who felt that the world had come to an end when Byron dies, had disappeared in the old man whose hopes in the “Christ to come” through science and the new social order, had completely gone out. Tennyson’s poetry has a long pedigree; and there are many quarterings on its coat of arms—among the heraldic colors is the vert of Wordsworth as well as the flaring vermilion of Byron; but there is one especially that cannot be expressed by any feudal tinct, and another that may be symbolized by many. The first it Theocritus; the second, Sir Thomas Malory.

From the first, Tennyson borrowed the title of the greatest of modern epics, “The Idyls of the King.” And the influence of Theocritus, the sweetest of all pastoral singers is found everywhere, but most of all in “Ænone.” Theocritus, who was an ancestor of Vergil and of all later pastoral poets, takes new life in Tennyson. Even the English verse translations of this singer of the reed and the cyprus and of the contest of the shepherds in the green pastures can not wholly shut his beauty from our view. It is as hard to endure his artificial image as set up by Pope as it is that of Chancer as regilded by Dryden. Even Mrs. Browning handles his exquisite idyls with a touch that does not fit the violet of the spring. In prose translations some of the aroma escapes, but enough of it remains to cheer the soul with loveliness. To read him in youth is never to forget him. For Theocritus was the poet of nature, the inventor of the little idyls-pictures of town or country—

that singer of idyls who, nearly three hundred years before Christ, saw dimly nature's God.

"And from above," he says in the seventh *eidulla*, "down upon our heads were waving to and fro many poplars and elms; and the sacred stream hard by kept murmuring, as it flowed down from the cave of the nymphs. And the fire-colored cicalas, on the shady branches, were toiling at chirping; while, from afar off, in the thick thorn-bushes the thrush was warbling. Tufted larks and gold-finches sang, the turtle-dove cooed; tawny bees were humming round the fountains; all things were breathing the incense of very plenteous summer and of fruit-time. Pears fell at our feet, and apples were rolling for us in abundance, and the boughs hung in profusion weighed down to the ground with plums."

The warmth of the summer is in Theocritus. The gold and purple bees float in the dry down of the thistle, and Demeter's symbols, the spikes of corn and poppies, glow golden and scarlet in the soft Sicilian air. Tennyson, too, gives the color of the summer and the incense of the autumn, in symbols suggested by the Syracusan. And, from the refrains of Theocritus, he borrows, as Poe borrows from Mangan, the cadence of his music.

Edmund Clarence Stedman, in "The Victorian Poets" has some pregnant chapters on the resemblance of Theocritus and Tennyson, and his passages showing how Theocritus vitalized the English poet as a bee vitalizes a flower are culled with exquisite insight and taste. Among these, Mr. Stedman quotes the delicious appeal of Cyclops to Galatea (in the XI Idyl), to compare it with the passage in Book VII of "The Princess"—

"Come down, O maid, from yonder mountain height;
What pleasure lives in height, (the shepherd sang),
In height and cold, the splendor of the hills?"

There is the echo of the Sicilian summer, in "The Gardener's Daughter"—

"All the land in flowery squares
Beneath a broad and equal-flowing wind,
Smelt of the coming summer,—
From the woods
Came voices of the well-contented doves.
The lark could scarce get out his notes for joy,

But shook his song together, as he neared
His happy home, the ground. To felt and right
The cuckoo told his name to all the hills;
The mellow ouzel fluted in the glen;
The red-cap whistled; and the nightingale
Sang loud as though he were a bird of day."

"*Cenone*," with the pathetic refrain, suggested by both Theocritus and Moschus, could not have existed in its present form, had not the Syracusan sung amid the hyacinth and arbutus.

In the black letter of Sir Thomas Malory, Tennyson read many times, until his mind and heart were steeped in the wonder of the old stories; and from the Elizabethan poets, who had learned much from their Italian brethren, he borrowed the allegory and added it to the tales of Sir Thomas. Spenser himself, following Ariosto,—for Ariosto is the chief literary ancestor of Spenser—had made an allegory. Tennyson strung the many colored gems of Sir Thomas on the silver string of his veiled meaning. Or, rather as he told his tales, the beads of his allegory slipped through his fingers. But the stories of the knights were greatly changed by the modern poet. Arthur is not, in "*The Idyls of the King*," the terrible monarch of fire and blood of Sir Thomas Malory. Another age and other manners have softened the chivalric compromises of the earlier times—for chivalry seems to have been a series of compromises with an ideal in the distance. The Arthur of Sir Thomas Malory is not the saintly King of Tennyson's imagination. In Malory's "*Morte d'Arthur*," he does and says things very inconsistent with the ideal, blameless king we love and revere in the "*Idyls*." And the allegory which Tennyson wove cannot be read into the rough doings of Arthur's knights. Nor did Sir Thomas, or the sympathetic Caxton who printed his book, see things as Spenser, Milton and Tennyson saw them—all these seeing differently according to the light of their time. But, if a book may be judged by its effects, the "*Morte d'Arthur*" does not deserve the condemnation of those Elizabethan Reformers, like Roger Ascham, who could excuse murder and adultery in an unrepentant real king, but

held up hands of horror at a mythical one, even when he repented.

"Herein," says the grand old printer, Caxton, in his preface to the "*Morte d'Arthur*," "may be seen noble chivalry, courtesy, humanity, friendlessness, hardiness, love, friendship, cowardice, murder, hate, virtue, sin. All is written for our doctrine, for to beware that we fall not into vice or sin, but to exercise and follow virtue, by which we may come and attain to good fame and renommé in this life, and after this to come unto everlasting bliss in Heaven; the which He grants us that reigneth in heaven, the Blessed Trinity. Amen."

"Ah, my Lord Arthur," cries Sir Bedevere, on the last day of the fight, "what shall become of me now ye go from me, and leave me here alone among my enemies?" "Comfort thyself," said the King, "and do as well as thou mayest, for in me is no trust for to trust in. For I will unto the vale of Avilion to heal me of my grievous wound. And if thou hear never more of me, pray for my soul!"

We can all recall the Homeric echo of this, in Tennyson's—

"The old order changeth, yielding place to new,
And God fulfils himself in many ways,
Lest one good custom should corrupt the world.
Comfort thyself: What comfort is in me?
I have lived my life, and that which I have done
May He within himself make pure! but thou
If thou should'st never see my face again,
Pray for my soul. More things are wrought by prayer
Than this world dreams of. Wherefore, let thy voice
Rise like a fountain for me night and day.
For what are men better than sheep or goats
That nourish a blind life within the brain,
If knowing God, they lift not hands in prayer
Both for themselves and those who call them friend?
For so the whole round earth is every way
Bound by gold chains about the feet of God."

"Now," says old Sir Thomas, when the roses have faded, "now we leave Guinever in Almsbury a nun in white and black, and there she was abbess and ruler, as reason would." How Tennyson refines upon this in the light of more cultured genius and finer days! You remember the simple little novice who sits at the sad queen's feet, and sings—

“ ‘Too late, too late, ye cannot enter now!’
They took her to themselves,”

Tennyson writes of the nuns and Guinevere—

“—and she
Still hoping, fearing, ‘is it yet too late?’
Dwelt with them till in time their Abbess died;
Then she, for her good deeds and her pure life,
And for the power of ministration in her,
And likewise for the high rank she had borne,
Was chosen Abbess; there, an Abbess, lived
For three brief years; and there, an Abbess passed
To where beyond these voices there is peace.”

It is the province of genius, as Emerson says, to borrow nobly. If the immediate ancestor of “*The Idyls of the King*” was the “*Morte d’Arthur*” as to matter, the remote ancestor was the “*Idyls*” of Theocritus as to form and manner. But I think it needs only time to show how many other prose writers and poets, how many changes of philosophies, customs, and point of view, it takes to make any writer who speaks to the soul with wisdom and to the heart with beauty. A poet descends from Heaven, step by step, like Jacob’s angels on bars of celestial light. God only can create him and the Ancient of Days makes every hour from the beginning move towards his coming—and each poet is the father of another poet.

Tennyson was the child of Sir Thomas Malory and of his own time as Dante was of Vergil and of his time, as Milton was of the old Testament as interpreted by the rebels of his time, as William Morris was of Chaucer, accentuated by the tense romanticism of Dante Rossetti and the early Provencal poets.

Theocritus, Sir Thomas Malory, Tennyson! How near and yet how far apart! And comparatively, how many allied shades they recall! You mention the “*Holy Grail*,” and up rise Spenser, Milton, Lowell—the Lowell of Sir Launfal—and then Wagner’s Parsifal and spirit of beauty after spirit of beauty until the earliest of them seems to touch the very

seraphim. We can as easily leave out St. Thomas and St. Francis of Assisi in considering the genesis of Dante as we can consider any modern great work of literature without reference to its pedigree. Music, too, is closely bound to literature—the myth of Lohengrin is only a later version of that of Cupid and Psyche. Wagner could not have done what he did without the *Nibelungenlied*; nor Gounod, if the Middle Age legend of “Faust” had not been told from mouth to mouth, until Goethe, borrowing nobly from the Book of Job, made “Faust” vital and grandiose for all time. If culture means the broadening of the mind through the widest knowledge of the best, it is hard to see with what reason we can neglect the study of the pedigrees of books.

If Tennyson succeeded Wordsworth, Tennyson also succeeded Byron. While Wordsworth was serene, a painter of nature, Byron was the opposite of him. He was fiery, volcanic, furious, lurid, great in genius. He was popular, while Wordsworth, whom the world is now only beginning to acknowledge, was neglected; so that, strange as it may seem at first, Tennyson’s immediate predecessor was Lord Byron. Byron’s popularity was great while he lived. The hero of “Locksley Hall”—I mean the first part of it, for I think the second part is decidedly the better—is a Byronic hero, diluted. And the hero of “Maud” is of a similar type.

In “Locksley Hall” the hero sighs and moans and calls Heaven’s vengeance down on his ancestral roof because a girl has refused to marry him—because his cousin Amy marries another man, he goes into a paroxysm of poetry and denunciation and prophecy. But, as Shakespere says—“Men have died from time to time and worms have eaten them, but not for love.” And the hero of “Locksley Hall” lives to write a calmer style a good many years later. “Maud” showed, like “Locksley Hall,” something of the influence of Byron. After “Locksley Hall,” and “Maud” the effect of Byron on Tennyson seems to grow less.

The young Tennyson’s favorite poet was Thomson—he of the serene and gentle “Seasons.” Mrs. Ritchie tells us how very early the influence of Thomson showed itself.

"Alfred's first verses, so I have heard him say, were written upon a slate which his brother Charles put into his hand one Sunday at Louth, when all the elders of the party were going into church, and the child was left alone. Charles gave him a subject—the flowers in the garden—and when he came back from church little Alfred brought the slate to his brother, all covered with written lines of blank verse. They were made on the models of Thomson's "Seasons," the only poetry he had ever read. One can picture it all to oneself, the flowers in the garden, the verses, the little poet with waiting eyes, and the young brother scanning the lines. 'Yes, you can write,' said Charles and he gave Alfred back the slate."

The poet of Alfred's first love was the calm and pleasant Thomson we see. Later, as he grew towards manhood, he read Byron. He scribbled in the Byronic strain. How strong a hold Byron's fiery verse had taken on the boy's mind is shown by his own confession. When Alfred was about fifteen, the news came that Byron was dead. "I thought the whole world was at an end," he said. "I thought everything was over and finished for everyone—that nothing else mattered. I remembered I walk out alone, and carved 'Byron is dead' into the sandstone." Although "Locksley Hall" and "Maud" show Byronic reflections, yet they were not the earliest published of Tennyson's poems.

The Greek poet, Moschus, wrote an elegy on his friend, Bion, and the refrain of this elegy, "Begin, Sicilian Muses, begin the lament," is famous. Tennyson, this modern poet, possessed of the Greek passion for symmetry and influence almost as much by Theocritus, Moschus, and Bion, as by the spirit of his own time, has made an elegy on his friend as solemn, as stately, as perfect in its form as that of Moschus; but not so spontaneous and tender. There is more pathos in King David's few words over the body of Absalom than in all the noble falls and swells of "In Memoriam."

I doubt whether any heart in affliction has received genuine consolation from this decorous and superbly measured flow of grief. It is not a poem of faith, nor is it a poem of doubt; but faith and doubt tread upon each other's footsteps. Instead of the divine certitude of Dante, we have a doubting half belief. Tennyson loved the village church, the holly-wreathed bap-

tismal font, the peaceful vicarage, because they represent serenity and order. He detests revolution. If he had lived, before the coming of Christ, in the vales of Sicily, he would probably have hated to see the rural sports of the pagans disturbed by the disciples of a less picturesque and natural religion.

Keats could not have been Keats as we know him without Spenser. He is called Greek, but he knew Greek best through Chapman's Homer. Yet, he caught the spirit; and the form for him did not matter; he had that from the *Epithalamium* of Spenser; and "no poet," as M. Texte admits, "has excited more vocations to poetry than Spenser." He is, like Shelley, the poet for the poet. Other poets may speak to the world; he sings to the sacred city. He lacks the elevation of Spenser, deflected as it was, by the Elizabethan concession to the political spirit of his time; he is without the unconsciousness of the Greeks whose spirit he assumed without understanding it. He longed for sensations rather than thoughts, for dreams, rather than activities. He was romantic, if romance implies aspiration. The "Ode to the Nightingale" expresses Keats. He was half in love with "easeful death." He was not Greek in this; his neo-Hellenism is like the paganism of Swinburn—it cannot rid itself of the shadow of the Cross; it is black against the light of the Resurrection. Like Maurice de Guérin, he loved the pleasure of sensation, and the fact that they must pass filled him with fear. He turns to the immortal figures on the Grecian Urn with wild regret;—all, in life that has life, dies—only the work of the artist who uses inorganic stuff for his material lives. He felt, indeed, that his name was writ in water before Shelly made that splendid epitaph! "Endymion" is a poem of shadows in the moonlight. It is not Greek, but it is touched by the spirit of Greece.

It is romantic because it bears everywhere the burden of the poet's longing. "A joy forever" he longs for; but all joys pass as the moon passes and the shades of beauty with it. Keats is a neo-Grecian, if you will; his literary ancestors are the gods of the rivers and the woods, as Greek singers made them; but he is nearer to Ovid than to Theocritus, nearer to

Vergil than to Bion, and nearest of all to this time—which, under the influence of sir Walter Scott and Byron was the time of longing for light and color and glow and beauty that should be eternal. He, in his turn, had influenced many. When we speak of the Pre-Raphaelites we imply the name of Keats. "The Earthy Paradise" of William Morris presumes the influence of Chaucer; but who can read from "The Earthy Paradise," without thinking of Keats

"Of Heaven or Hell I have no power to sing,
I cannot ease the burden of your fears,
Or make quick coming death a little thing,
Or bring again the pleasures of past years,
Nor for my words shall ye forget your tears,
Or hope again for aught I can say,—
The idle singer of an empty day."

What we call the Puritanism of Spenser was, on its spiritual side, the eclipsed light of the Catholic years that has passed; it sustained him—for he was the son of Ariosto and of Truth and Beauty. And the Puritanism of Milton—of the mind, not of the heart—while it vitiated his Christianity, did not subdue his Hebraic elevation. Keats, the poet of earthly beauty, had the feeling of the Greek for the sensations of life, but he was oppressed by the fear that a day would come when he and life must part. Heine, a great lyrist, too (he was Greek by turns, less sublimated than Keats) stood old, almost blind, paralyzed, at the foot of the statue of Venus of Melos, in the Louvre. And the world seemed about to go to pieces, for the Revolution of '48 roared around him. The true Greek would have died, satisfied that he had lived his life. But Heine, who had lived for earthly beauty and joy, who was already dead because the pleasures of life were dead to him, cried aloud in despair. Earth could not give immortality! Of these neo-Greeks—not of the old Greeks, but touched by their spirit—was Keats.

The elegy of Theocritus for Daphnis has echoed ever since he called on the Sicilian muses to weep with him. If it, with the recurrent refrain of musical sorrow, touched Tennyson in

our time to sing of the dead Hallam, it spurred Milton to raise the voice of music over Lycidas and Shelley to consecrate the immortal Adonais to Keats. The pedigree of the English elegy is as easily traced as that of the English ode, with whose richness our literature actually blazes. The Pindaric ode is a name of horror in English, since a slavish imitation of the sublime Greek distorted some of the finest odes of Gray and Collins. The spirit of Pindar helped to make the English ode the most beautiful in all the world, but the attempt to give Greek form to our verse has almost ruined, by meaningless strophes and antistrophes, some of the loveliest of English odes. I need only indicate the pedigree of the ode at the highest by mentioning three sublime names,—St. Teresa, Crashaw, Coventry Patmore.

The raptures of St. Teresa inspired Crashaw with the ode beginning—

“ Love, thou art absolute sole lord
Of life and death,”

and with that other ode, less dignified because its form is an English imitation of the exquisite ever-changing music of Pindar which can only be transmitted into our tongue by interpretation. Pindar influences the form and St. Teresa the spirit; but Patmore is touched by Crashaw and not at all by the form of Pindar, though he is nearer to Pindar than any of the poets who failed to see that each of his odes had a delicate shell-like music of their own which could not be expressed by a short jumping line thrown in here and there among the longer ones. “Each of the Odes of Pindar,” William Sharp says, “has its own music, as each conch stranded by the waves has its own forlorn vibration of the sea’s rhythm: whereas the so-called Pindaric Odes of Cowley and his imitators have no more individuality of music than have the exercises of instrumentals in contradistinction to the compositions of musicians.” The pedigree of the Pindaric ode in English offers an admirable subject for the study of a beautiful form twisted into an incongruous shape by poets who blindly followed one another.

There can be no question that a comparative study of the

literature of the Japanese and the Italian, the Basque and the Teuton would make for cosmopolitanism, but who can speak of fixed literary laws which shall bear exact scientific analysis, without stretching the word "literary" so thin that it must break? Philosophy may be cosmopolitan or international—Christianity is universal; and if the whole world were Christendom—animated and active—there would be only one spirit in literature; but literature of itself must, until the world shall all be one way of thinking and feeling, be as varied as Milton's leaves in Vallombrosa—for no two leaves are exactly alike, though they are all leaves.

Still, the value and beauty of literature are best studied by processes of comparison which may be called scientific. And these processes of comparison are rendered easier by the consideration of the pedigrees of books.

MAURICE FRANCIS EGAN.

HISTORIANS OF THE MEDIEVAL PAPACY.

In the second part of "Political Theories Ancient and Medieval," by Professor W. A. Dunning of Columbia,¹ we have the latest and in many respects the ablest exposition in English of the Protestant view upon papal politics in the Middle Ages. Before criticizing directly it will not be out of place to look backward in order to see how much advance or retrogression in historical science is marked by this book. Some prefatory remarks are therefore in order, as to the course of historical criticism in the study of the Middle Ages in general and of papal politics in particular.

No words need be wasted on the first point: As is well known the revival of interest in those ages came in on the wave of romanticism represented by Walter Scott, at least so far as the public was concerned. True! long before this a number of tireless workers were busy compiling their stupendous collections of documents which were to furnish the first materials for the student. No centuries boast abler discoverers than the seventeenth and eighteenth with their long list of Benedictines, Jesuits, secular clergymen and laymen. Such were Bollandus, Wadding, the Assemani, Mabillon, Muratori, Labbe, Coletti, Cossart, who labored so well on the councils, liturgy, national antiquities, etc.

But allowing for these the study of medieval history was rare at least on the part of the general reader. This was especially true of England. To Sir Philip Sidney (1554-1586) the Middle Ages were a "millennium of darkness," a "misty

¹ Macmillan, New York, 1902. In preparing this paper the present writer could not justly be expected to have read all the authors here criticized, nor have the sources of information been as accessible as he could wish. Thus he has been compelled to put down many statements on the authority of others. He has consulted very freely various articles in the *Dublin Review* (December, 1844, April, 1876, October, 1877, April, 1877, the last three particularly); also the learned introduction by M. Alex. de Saint Chéron to the French translation of Hurter's *History of Innocent III* (Paris, 1838); the critiques of church historians in the introductions to Alzog's and Hergenröther's general histories, and the exhaustive bibliographies added to each chapter in same. The "Dictionary of National Biography" and the "Biographie Universelle" of Michaud supplied many items of information. The same can be said of the able Catholic apologies of Hergenröther ("Church and State") and Gosselin ("Power of the Popes").

time," "uncivil age hung with dust and cobwebs," a verdict that remained valid to the latter half of the eighteenth century. Then a change began, almost imperceptibly. Medieval architecture commenced to fascinate dilettanti of the type of Horace Walpole (1717-1797) and the poet Gray (1716-1771). Percy's *Reliques* published in 1765 likewise announced a change in sentiment. A more powerful impulse came from Germany in the shape of Goethe's first work "*Götz von Berlichingen*" in 1773, which aroused the enthusiasm of Walter Scott, to whom the Romantic movement in all its phases owes so much. Yet even this was largely unsympathetic. Scott and Wordsworth retained the old religious prejudices against the Middle Ages. This was yet to be overcome before these were to be studied with any degree of thoroughness. The renaissance of Gothic architecture under Pugin was not without its effect, nor again was the romantic movement in English literature quite foreign to the change. However, the latter was really accomplished by the Oxford movement with John Henry Newman as leader. The immediate results upon medieval history are well known to all readers of that master and of his friends and disciples, Church, Hurrell Froude, J. W. Bowden, Maitland, Kenelm Digby, Dalgairns, Dean Milman, Neale, Mrs. Hemans and Mrs. Jameson. Then began the publication of the *Rolls Series* in 1857 which made the medieval records of England accessible to a degree hitherto impossible, and raised the study of the past to its present high plane of thoroughness, as is evidenced in the works of James Bryce, Freeman, Stubbs, Haddan, Bishop, Stevenson and others. Much bitterness and not a little ignorance still exist, but the advance from Gibbon and Robertson to Bishop Stubbs and Mr. Bryce is astonishing. Nor are signs wanting that an equal advance will be made in the early years of the new century.

The story is pretty much the same for all Europe. The Oxford movement in England was but a local manifestation of this general turning towards medievalism. Its first effects in Italy are seen in the labors of Cesare Balbo (1789-1853), Cesare Cantù (living in 1898), Tosti, Capecelatro, Troja, Cibrario, etc. Germany adds such names as Pertz and Waitz,

Hurter, Phillips, Jaffé, Potthast, Leo, Hefele, Hergenröther, Voigt, Raumer and a host of others. Even irreligious and Gallican France responded to the impulses of Châteaubriand, and produced such writers as Montalembert, Rio, Guérard, Delisle, the two Thierry's, Ozanam, Ampère, Michélet, Lécroy de la Marche, Ménard, Pouchet, Huillard Bréholle, Guizot, etc. Despite such able works, however, France is even to-day perceptibly less sympathetic to things medieval than are Germany, Italy and even Protestant England. The reasons for this will be stated below.

In general then the advance in medieval studies is more than satisfactory despite the yet remaining prejudice. But the same cannot be said of the modern attitude towards that which is the very heart of medieval history—the Papacy. Enough prejudice exists even yet to seriously mar the very best treatises on those times. And let it be recorded with shame that this state of affairs is due as much to Catholics as to Protestants. One might almost be justified in asserting that it is due *chiefly* to Catholics of France.

If the Papacy to-day is the target for coarse abuse even in the pages of learned writers, the blame can be laid very largely at the door of Gallicanism. By Gallicanism is not meant a love of France which is the right and duty of all Frenchmen, as such being as admirable as any other nationalism whether Americanism or Italianism. But we mean a distinctively anti-papal spirit of historical criticism which from the time of and in the interest of that incarnation of royal despotism, Louis XIV, has infected pretty much all modern French historians, even the most Catholic, at least until well on into the nineteenth century. As a body they can be justly charged with an habitually unscrupulous treatment of papal history and of sacrificing the papacy whenever it withstood their monarchical absolutism. They originated and kept alive the most unworthy calumnies and allied themselves, even when Catholic, to that interminable list of free-thinking historians who have made of historical writing such a terrible instrument for the destruction of reverence for the Holy See. Their best excuse is that they after all have merely reechoed the anti-papal prejudices of writers contemporary with the popes of a past age.

The story is a long and a sad one. It begins in the Middle Ages itself, first with the tremendous conflict between the papacy and emperors like Henry IV, Frederic Barbarossa, Frederic II, and kings like Philip the Fair of France. For that struggle was fought out only with arms and diplomacy at Canossa, Anagni and Avignon, but as well with the pen by the legist, canonist and publicist. The names of the protagonists may be seen in Otto Gierke's "Political Theories of the Middle Ages," as translated by Professor Maitland (Cambridge, 1900). Dante takes a partisan stand in the *Divina Commedia*. The popular histories like those of Martinus Polonus and Matthew Paris are colored with anti-papal prejudice. The very songs of the tavern and university reflect the same.¹ It becomes yet bitterer in the writings of Marsiglio of Padua, Occam, Pierre Dubois and that crowd of brilliant but unscrupulous writers during the saddest age of the Church beginning with the Avignon residence and closing with the Council of Constance.

It was not be expected that those countries which embraced Protestantism would give up their hatred for the medieval Popes—and so for almost three centuries after Luther they are given scant justice in Germany, England and any other Protestant country. But, as above noted, the shame of it is that they were given no more by French Catholic writers of the same period, so much so that it remained for Protestant writers, above all German, to render the Popes the justice so long denied them. M. Gosselin, a Frenchman himself, admits the truth of this statement in no equivocal terms in the conclusion of his admirable work² where he also indicates the fundamental cause of this anti-papal prejudice on the part of French Catholic writers "interested in supporting the cause of those *princes* who had incurred the anathemas of the Church." Only a cursory reading is necessary to find the one man to whom most of it is due. He is the famous Abbé Claude Fleury (1640-1723), friend and intimate of Bossuet, author of an otherwise admirable "Ecclesiastical History" termed by Voltaire the best of its kind ever written. Here then the genealogy of at least modern anti-papal history commences in France. True, Bossuet, his

¹ Cf. "Political Songs" ed. by Thos. Wright, Camden Soc., 1839.

² "Power of the Popes in the Middle Ages," Vol. II, pp. 357-358, cf. p. 307.

master, was no ultramontane, but his greater genius saved him from the grosser errors of the disciple.¹ Fleury, though imbibing much of his hostility from Bossuet, went far beyond him in vituperation of the great medieval Popes such as Gregory VII, Innocent III and of course Boniface VIII, the last opponent of French absolutism whether in church or state. Being a Catholic priest his views, presented with admirable style, and with superior narrative power, found way even more easily than those of the Protestant Centuriators of Magdebourg. They have held their own with comparative tenacity well into the nineteenth century, nor have yet completely disappeared.² Among the numberless French historians from his day to this, there are comparatively only a few exceptions to the general prejudice against the medieval popes.

Consider the long list of those who are anti-papal more or less. Voltaire (1694–1778) of course: Mézerai (History of France, 1643–1651); l'Abbé Velly (History of France, 1765–1785); l'Abbé Vertot (1655–1735); Lebeau (Histoire du Bas-Empire, 1757); l'Abbé Millot (Eléments de l'Histoire de France, 1767; other works in 1774, 1772, 1796); Daunou (1761–1840) who wrote at Napoleon's command and in order to justify the latter's suppression of the papal Temporal Power his "Essai historique sur la puissance temporelle des Papes"; Capefigue (Histoire de Philippe Auguste, 1827–1829); Michelet (Histoire de France, 1833–1860); Sismondi (Histoire des Républiques Italiennes au Moyen Age, 1801; Histoire des Français, 1821–1844; Littérature du Midi de l'Europe, 1813) whose brilliancy has given such popularity to his venom; Count de Ségur (Histoire de France); Anquetil (Histoire de France, 1805, Histoire Universelle, 1797); A. Thierry (Récits des Temps Mérovingiens, 1833–1837, Considerations sur l'histoire de France); Michaud (History of the Crusades, 1811); Guizot (1787–1874); Bernardi (1751–1824); Villemain (1790–1870), Henri Martin, Victor Duruy, and so on. All of them bear the hall-mark of Gallican dislike or suspicion of the Papacy whether they be downright irreligious like Daunou, Sismondi and

¹ Op. cit., II, 300–301.

² On Fleury see op. cit., I, 223; II, 134, 319. Also Hurter, *Introd.*, p. x-xiii.

Thierry or rationalist like Michelet, Copefigue, Guizot (fairest of them all) or really Catholic like Fleury.¹

Against this formidable array which, by the way, is far from complete the loyal Catholic reader can pit a mere handful of writers like De Maistre (Du Pape, 1819); Père Daniel, S. J. (History of France, 1713) who occasionally displays a Gallican spirit of unfairness;² M. De la Porte du Theil who in 1791 supplemented Baluze with the unedited letters of Pope Innocent III and inserted a careful and just memoir of the same pontiff in Vol. VI of his "Notices et Extraits des Manuscrits de la Bibliothèque Nationale et autres bibliothèques; publiées par l'Institut National de France"; Châteaubriand (1768-1848); Montalembert (1777-1831); Christophe, Abbé Verlaque, O. Delarc, Léon Gautier, Ozanam, etc.—men whose works, we make bold to say, are more popular outside of than in France, whereas the works of anti-papal writers have received immense popularity in France where they are

"livrés entre les mains de la jeunesse, chez laquelle ils propagent les opinions les plus fausses sur les faits et les hommes de nos traditions religieuses et nationales . . . On réimprime chaque jour Mézerai, Anquetil, Velly, Millot . . . le Père Daniel instruit, exact, sage et vrai on le laisse dans l'oublie."³

Nor is France alone to blame. German Catholic writers of the age of Joseph II, with a few exceptions like the Jesuit Joseph Pohl (1753) were all infected with the prevailing hostility towards the Popes, sharpened by not a little rationalism and coarsened by still more ignorance. Thus Dannenmeyer, Royco, Wolf, Michl, Schalfus, Stoeger, Becker, Gudenus, whose works were published variously from 1776 to 1811.

"D'historiographie ecclésiastique dans le sens élevé de ce mot, il n'y en avait point dans l'Allemagne Catholique de ce temps." (Her-genröther's "Histoire de l'Eglise," Vol. I, p. 51.)

It was not until the appearance of Count Leopold von Stolberg's "History of the Religion of Jesus Christ," in 1806-1818,

¹ For a critique of these and other anti-ultramontane writers see Gosselin, I, pp. xv, xxvi, 223, 246, 287; II, 5, 6, 8, 12, 134, 307, 319, 326, 357-8; also Hurter, introd., pp. x-xiii; here we mention merely a few names at random as the list is too lengthy for a review article. Cf. also Gorini, "Défense de l'Eglise," 2d ed., 1858.

² See Gosselin, II, 40, 44, 128, 239.

³ Hurter, pp. xvii, xxi.

that a better era commenced. The old prejudice still animated the works of such writers as Locherer (pub. 1824-1834) and Reichlin-Meldegg (pub. 1830), though the tide was turned back by Katerkamp (1819-1834), Döllinger (1833), Hefele, Hergenröther, Schwab and other recent writers (see Alzog, Vol. I, pp. 50-54). These writers and their loyal confrères in France have done much to put the Papacy in its true light, but it will take several generations to undo the harm by the above-mentioned Gallican and Josephist writers, if the harm is really ever to be completely undone, which we doubt. Of these men it is difficult to write calmly. Doubtless they were sincere, but an American Catholic finds in himself little sympathy for men who have sacrificed the papacy to a blind defence of royalty and its extravagant ecclesiastical pretensions.

The key to their anti-papal utterances is apparently not a love of church but of that royal absolutism represented by the Grand Monarque and voiced by its Court orator:¹ Words such as these make at least an American suspicious of their author's complaints against the ambition of the Popes who, whatever their faults, have been too democratic to accept any such apotheosis of royalty.

From this view at the anti-papal utterances of Catholic historians it is refreshing to turn to the consideration of fairer and abler Protestant historians, who, be it said to their credit, have, on certain lines, rehabilitated the medieval papacy so unjustly calumniated by its natural friends. Stranger still it is from Germany in particular, from the very land of the Hohenstaufen, that popes like Innocent III and Gregory VII have received their vindication. We should have expected the opposite, as it is but natural to presuppose that the memories of Canossa and Manfred and Barbarossa would have lingered forever as terrible legacies. But somehow or other the German loves the Middle Ages more than any other European. Perhaps it is so because he is more medieval even to-day than any other. At all events he has rehabilitated the Papacy with an indifference

¹ "L'autorité royale est absolue. Le prince ne doit rendre-compte à personne de ce qu'il ordonne. . . . Contre l'autorité du Prince il ne peut y avoir de remède que dans son autorité." (Words of Bossuet from his "La Politique tirée des propres paroles de l'Ecriture" quoted by Adolph Franck on p. 10 of "Réformateurs et Publicistes du dix-septième siècle.")

to religious prejudice which is highly creditable to his historical candor.

To Germany we owe the epoch-making histories of Gregory VII by Voigt (1815), of the Papacy by Leopold von Ranke (1834-1836), of Innocent III by Hurter (1833-1834), of Sylvester II by Hock, of the Crusades by Wilken (1823-1825), the "Apology of Pope Gregory VII" by Gaab (Tubingen, 1792) and "Vindication of Gregory VII" by the same (2 Vols., 1786), "Pope Gregory VII and his Age" by Gfrörer (Schaffhausen, 1859, sq., 7 vols.), "Lectures on German History" by John von Müller (see Vol. II), "History of the Constitution of Christian Ecclesiastical Society" by Planck (Hanover, 1806, 5 vols.) and a number of other works written almost entirely by Protestants which have done wonders in dissipating the prejudices against the medieval Papacy fostered by Catholic, Josephist and Gallican historians of the preceding age.¹

Following upon and partly accompanying these works there appeared a series of able and temperate works on the medieval papacy in other countries, both from Catholics and Protestants. Thus the "Storia di Bonifazio VIII" (1846) by Don Luigi Tosti of the Benedictine Order, the "Histoire de la Papauté au quatorzième siècle" (Paris, 1853) by the Abbé Christophe; the "Temporal Power of the Popes" by the Sulpician Gosselin (2d part pub. in 1839, 2 vols.); the "Défense de l'Eglise" by the Abbé Gorini; the "Grand Schisme d'Occident" by L. Salembier (1900); the splendid work on Gregory VII and the Reform of the Church by the Abbé O. Delarc (3 vols., 1889); "Grégoire VII" by Davin (Tournai, 1867); the monumental labors of Hefele on the Councils and Cardinal Hergenröther's masterly essay on "Church and State" (Eng. trans., 2 vols., London, 1876)—all witness to the fact that Catholics pretty generally in continental Europe have at last come to their senses and are striving to undo, if possible, the harm done the Church by the systematic misrepresentation of the medieval papacy in its relations to the civil power by the Gallican Catholic writers above mentioned.

¹Of course even these works, as might be expected from the Protestant opinions of their authors, frequently state views with which most Catholics would disagree. For instance even Voigt and Hurter. See Gosselin, I, XXVII, 299; II, 21.

In England also the tide is turning in favor of a more liberal treatment of the medieval popes and their politics at the hands of Protestants. To William Roscoe is it due. He is the historical antecessor of Voigt, Hurter, Hock and Ranke, being certainly the first English Protestant who dared to write a favorable biography of any pope. I refer, of course, to his "Life of Leo X" published in 1805, ten years before Voigt's Gregory VII appeared. In spirit and method it offered a complete revulsion from the unjust volumes of the ex-Jesuit Archibald Bower. Other succeeding Anglican writers have caught much of his spirit of fairness and are gradually dropping the philosophic sneer of Gibbon and the literary superciliousness of Hallam when writing of the Papacy, though much of the old leaven yet remains. Milman's "History of Christianity" (1840) and "History of Latin Christianity" (1854-1855) are good instances of ability marred by the traditional anti-papal prejudice. The "Lectures on Medieval Church History" by Archbishop Trench mark an advance in liberality; whilst Maitland's "Dark Ages" (1844) and "Essays on the Reformation" reach the very high-water mark of fairness. But English historians are not very generally attracted to medieval papal history. Hence there is a comparative dearth of works on that subject. To those above mentioned there are few to add. Among them very prominently stands the best and most complete life of Gregory VII in English by John William Bowden (London, 1840, 2 vols.). The most recent works in English are Father Mann's two volumes on the Popes of the Early Middle Ages (London, 1902) and Father Barry's "Papal Monarchy" (Story of the Nations Series).

Lastly coming to the very special questions of the Holy Roman Empire, of the political relations of Popes and temporal sovereigns, there does not seem to be very much advance either in tone or in research amongst writers in English.

The first writer of any note to write at any length upon the subject was Gibbon,¹ whose faults and virtues as a critic are well enough known to dispense with fresh comment. Suffice

¹ For a critique on Gibbon's treatment of papal history see Gosselin, I, 243-4, 291.

to note in this connection that he touches upon Papal history only as a side issue to his main subject of the Roman Empire in its decline. But, nevertheless, he has impressed his spirit upon all succeeding English writers as deeply as Fleury impressed his upon French historians. He is quoted extensively, by the very latest—Tout, Dunning, who are more or less poisoned with his scepticism. Even Father Barry speaks of Gibbon as “the mocking not unkindly sceptic”—an estimate which, to put it mildly, we are at a loss to comprehend.

But as Gibbon's monumental work was beyond the grasp of the general reader a continuous history of the Holy Roman Empire for English students was felt to be a necessity. This want was very inadequately met by Mr. James Bryce who published in 1864 his universally known “Holy Roman Empire.” It had many merits, was fairer in tone than Gibbon, was brilliant in style and reduced the subject to limits suitable for the general public. But its many defects prevented it from fully meeting the want. Besides being entirely too subjective in treatment it is almost hopelessly confused. The average reader wanders through it in pretty much the same condition of mind that he would blunder through a South African jungle. But, defective as it is, it has held its own even to the present writing as the best all-around history of the subject in English, having passed through many editions. This becomes all the more apparent when we consider the other works of a similar nature. In 1898 was published “The Medieval Empire” by Herbert Fisher (2 vols.). A scholarly production but even more disappointing than the preceding because it confines its attention solely to the German or Imperial side of the question. It should be entitled rather “The German Medieval Empire.” Mr. T. F. Tout's “Empire and Papacy” published in this same year might easily have superseded Bryce had the author not been compelled by his circumstances to stop at the year 1273, or had he even with this handicap inserted a chapter or two upon the early Papacy before 918 and upon the *theory* of the Holy Roman Empire. As far as it goes it is a decided improvement upon Bryce in every particular, above all in being objective in treatment and lucid in arrangement. Two other

volumes treat only of the theoretical aspects of the case somewhat in the fashion of essayists. Reference is made to the brilliant exposition of the theory of the "indirect power" of the popes over temporalities by Mr. William Molitor in his "Burning Questions" and to the essay in the *Contemporary Review* (February, 1876) by Sir George Bowyer entitled "Concordantia Sacerdotii atque Imperii," published afterwards in book form.¹ Both writers are, we believe, Catholic.

Two other remarkable books appeared in 1902. One on "Political Theories" by Mr. Dunning, the other above mentioned, by Dr. William Barry, entitled "The Papal Monarchy." Criticism of Father Barry's monograph is difficult. Perhaps the consciousness of his Catholicity embarrassed him in his work intended for a presumably non-sectarian (?) public. At all events his work touches only upon the political side of the Papacy, and even there confines itself, when possible, to Rome. It is even narrower in scope than Tout. Mr. Dunning's work, as its title implies, deals only with theories. So that, to sum up, it will be seen that there is no complete history of the Holy Roman Empire in English. It has been best treated in all its phases by Bryce, but his work is too manifestly defective to be final. There yet remains, perhaps, too much prejudice to allow of a complete and fair history philosophically planned and executed. At present we can only deal with particular aspects or phases of the mighty theme.

Such then is the present state of historical enquiry regarding the Medieval Papacy in its political relations. As Mr. Dunning has written by far the most pretentious and able work on his particular subject in English, a detailed examination of his work will serve the very useful purpose of showing the defects of historians in this branch and as well the means by which to avoid past mistakes.²

¹ Cf. *Dublin Review*, April, 1876.

² Our criticism confines itself to the controversial side. But in passing, one cannot avoid noticing how generally the author omits all reference to what we might call national politics and the theories which went *pari passu* with them, theories which existed though not enunciated in the same elaborate fashion as those affecting the Papacy and Empire; an omission all the more illogical as he says (p. xxv) that his object was to present only such theories which had a close "relation to political fact." Thus, for instance, in the famous song on "The Battle of Lewes" composed about the middle of the thirteenth century by an ardent champion of the popular cause led by Simon de Montfort we have

That we deal at such length with this book is ample warrant that we consider it a work of prime importance. From a point of view of both scholarship and fairness of at least tone it is an advance upon Gibbon and Bryce. The author, moreover, is evidently sincere. But there praise ends and an unwilling criticism begins. Despite its many excellencies there are the ancient ear-marks of hostility to the papacy, which mar an otherwise creditable work. Gibbon's influence is only too apparent. The reader will understand this better by a glance at the bibliography, because the character of the books habitually consulted by an author are a fair index of the bent of his mind. Of course, no author can be expected to supply an irreproachable bibliography especially when his subject is such a vast one as medieval politics. But, if a writer gives a list of books at all, he should at least not omit *systematically* many of the very best books upon his subject. And when a question is a controversy, as this one of medieval papal politics is, necessarily though unfortunately, common fairness would require a writer to mention and consult the best apologists on both sides. Mr. Dunning apparently has read but one side. In fact he seems to be ignorant or at least ignores almost entirely the many first-class works that present the papal position in a more favorable light. In the general bibliography he mentions, in almost a spasm of generosity, Pastor, Janssen, Mansi and one or two modern Catholic writers, but there they lie buried, Mansi and Janssen being quoted only twice in the special bibliographies. But not a word of that long list of able writers, both Catholic and Protestant, who have more or less defended the Papacy—Hergenröther, Hurter, Voigt, Bowden, Hefele, Philipps, Muratori, Ozanam, Vacandard, Christophe, Grisar, Tosti, Gosselin, Balbo, Baronius, Cantù, Hettinger, Gautier, Schwab, Von Reumont, etc. Whereas there is not omitted any

quite an elaborate discussion on the nature of kingship, right of rebellion, right of the people to representation, etc. Being composed in the very thick of the struggle for Parliamentary liberties at the critical period of English constitutional development it probably has had as much to do with "political fact" as any document quoted by Mr. Dunning. (See "Political Songs of England," ed. by Thos. Wright for the Camden Society, 1839.) Mr. Edward Jenck's "Law and Politics in the Middle Ages" (1898) is the very antithesis of the work here criticised. Disregarding all Imperial politics it goes to the heart of national law and custom, tracing with a lawyer's acumen the development of the state as such out of the clan and feudalism.

anti-papal writer of note, but many are inserted the titles of whose works the author must have found with considerable difficulty. The bibliography of texts is not included in this criticism.¹

Now these names above given stand in the very front rank of historians, above all Cardinal Hergenröther, author of a "General History of the Church" and an exhaustive treatise on the relations between "Church and State." This latter work is a classic; it is the most ample and learned defense of the papal position ever published. It has an apparatus of learning enough to satisfy the most exacting German professor. In a word it is par excellence *the* book from the papal point of view. But not a word about it has Mr. Dunning. Such an omission is simply inexcusable. Take some others. The lives of Gregory VII by Voigt and Bowden have no superiors. Hurter's life of Innocent III is the classic on that subject. Tosti's "Life of Boniface VIII" comes from the pen of one of the most learned Italians of this century. Yet they are all passed over in silence. Equally reprehensible is the omission of the work so frequently referred to by us—that of M. Gosselin. This treatise is admirable in every way: learned, fair and temperate. True, it is not very recent, but Mr. Dunning quotes other inferior works of a much greater antiquity.²

So much for the general bibliography. The same for the special ones at the end of each chapter, which indicate yet more clearly the character of the author's researches. For example let us take that at the end of Chapter IX, one of the most able and typical chapters in the whole book. It deals with "Theories during the Decline of the Papal Hegemony," discussing among others such characters as Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair. Now what are the authorities cited on the famous quarrel between these two? Pierre Dubois, an open foe of Boniface and

¹ Considering how lengthily our author quotes anti-papal contemporary writers like Dubois, Occam, Marsiglio of Padua, Gerson et al, the reader can consult the contemporary writers in favor of the popes in Alzog and Hergenröther's "General Histories." For instance list of those for and against Gregory VII, p. , Alzog II, p. 481, note; better still in Hergenröther III, p. 573-4 (French trans. of Abbé P. Belet, Paris, 1886), also in the "Histoire Générale" of Lavisse-Ramnaud (II, pp. 115-116). It would also be well to read Gosselin (II, 199-239, 359 sqq.) on the opinions of medieval publicists and canonists who are judged somewhat inaccurately by Mr. Dunning.

² For opinions on Gosselin's book see his own references. Vol. I, p. xvii.

supporter of Philip; Pierre Dupuy, a sixteenth century Gallican, intense royalist, admirer of Philip whom he praises "pour la généreuse poursuite qu'il fit contre le pape Boniface"—the generosity consisting in public insult in open Parliament, physical outrage at Anagni and vile, remorseless calumny after death; Baillet, a seventeenth century Jansenist and none too friendly to Boniface; Adolph Franck, a Jew, who, though calm in style and able as a controversialist, is certainly not pro-papal in any sense of the term;¹ P. Janet, in general an elegant and cultured writer, but by no means sympathetic with Boniface;² Francois Laurent, to whose eyes the papacy is the "esprit de domination incarné" and "un vrai danger pour le Christianisme" (p. 514, op. cit.); Renan, who needs no comment; Blakey who asserts that:

"In proportion as the political power of the church became more concentrated and energetic, in the same ratio was the religious liberty of the subject curtailed and abridged. . . . Ignorance consequently became the only absolute safeguard against the intellectual intolerance of the clerical body; so that the minds of the people became enveloped in the most profound and impenetrable darkness," etc.³

Bryce's Holy Roman Empire about which our opinion is above expressed; Gierke, a typical "German" scholar, generally objective but certainly not in sympathy with anything papal; Gieseler, a learned and temperate Protestant. On Friedberg I do not risk an opinion, not having his work. So then the author refers the reader to every writer⁴ of consequence who is either distinctly hostile or at best indifferent to the papal side of this crucial quarrel between the medieval papacy and the civil power. But what of the writers favorable to it? Everyone is omitted. There is no mention of Hergenröther's masterly defence of Boniface in Essay IX of his "Catholic Church and Christian State," nor of Boniface's milder critics such as Boutaric (*La France sous Philippe le Bel*), though he is mentioned in the general bibliography. Also

¹ See for instance his estimate of Saurez in his "Réformateurs et Publicistes de l'Europe au dixseptième siècle."

² See p. 457 of Vol. I of work cited by Dunning where he speaks of the "flots bouillants de son orgueil et de son ambition," i. e., of Boniface.

³ P. 317, Vol. I, op. cit.

⁴ For other anti-papal writers, more or less bigoted, see Gosselin passim, particularly II, 138, 140, 4-5, 19, 137, 20.

omitted are the excellent works of the Benedictine Luigi Tosti, ("Storia di Bonifazio," VIII, Monte Cassino, 1846), of Cesare Cantù (Boniface VIII, Dante e Cecco d'Ascoli in *Revue d'Economie Chrétienne* for May, 1866), of Cardinal Wiseman (Essays, Vol. III), of J. Jolly (Philippe le Bel, Paris, 1869), of Christophe's "Histoire de la Papauté au XIV siècle" (Paris, 1853), of the Abbé Peltier's "Traité de la puissance ecclésiastique" (1857), of Gosselin's "Power of the Popes," of the above mentioned monographs by Bowyer and Molitor, of Philipps' works on German canon and feudal law published from 1832 to 1851, of the general church histories of Hergenröther and Alzog fully equal to Gieseler, or lastly of the able essays on these subjects in such Catholic periodicals as the *Dublin Review*.

The conclusion is evident. Either our author is ignorant of or deliberately ignores much of the best literature on his subject.¹

In either case it strikes us as high time to call a halt upon such high-handed proceedings. We decline politely but none the less firmly to be brushed aside as ignorant, to have our ablest advocates contemptuously ignored by writers who are in no way their superiors and in many respects their inferiors. A typical instance of this spirit can be found in p. 313 of Mr. Tout's work. He refers to Hurter's "Geschichte des Papsts Innocenz III" as "rather an old-fashioned book," doubtless because published in 1833. Yet both Tout and Dunning will not hesitate to cite anti-papal writers of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries like Du Puy and Baillet, Mr. Dunning even refers us to Hallam, a gentleman who confessed that he had "hardly any direct acquaintance with the original sources of medieval history,"² yet omits all reference to Hurter who gave up twenty years to the study of the age of Innocent III alone. This present work on "Political

¹ If one considers us biased in referring the reader to the bibliographies of Catholic writers like Alzog and Hergenröther as a corrective for those supplied by Mr. Dunning, let him turn to the learned and not Catholic "Histoire Générale" of Lavissee-Rambaud. In their bibliographies we find mentioned most of the works referred to by us. Thus (Vol. II, p. 116) we see noticed Voigt, Gfrörer, Delarc; Hurter on p. 233; Tosti on p. 63—all of which writers our author disdains to notice.

² See *Dublin Review*, February, 1841; November 1841.

Theories'' is the latest and most colossal instance of this crass ignorance and bland contempt of any writing that is favorable to the Papacy. Such a spirit is unfair; it is uncritical, and it is bound to keep open the wounds of controversy. Whatever it is, it is not historical.

Such being the company usually kept by our author it is to be expected that he should make out a bad case for the papacy in general. The popes of course ''ruthlessly employed their power'' (p. 144). Gregory I ''greatly promoted the tendency of the faith to ignorance and superstition'' (159). Then we hear the familiar ring that echoes back to Du Puy, Gibbon, Fleury of the ''arrogance'' (170) of Gregory VII, the ''ingenuity'' (173) of Innocent III. The popes prevent the national consolidation of Italy (289); seek to govern *all* the destinies of mankind without responsibility to any temporal power (146); their ''motives'' are always therefore ''obvious'' (223) *i. e.*, to Mr. Dunning; they are ever opposed to the sentiment of nationality, for instance in the case of Boniface (224), though Father Barry pays his respects to *that* charge with ungloved hands (p. 416 of his work). And so on with tiresome monotony the time-worn adjectives and nouns are dunned into our ears—the same old charges that one can read better put by Gibbon, Janet, Laurent, Du Puy, Baillet, Bryce, etc. It is wearisome reading, verily. Although we do Mr. Dunning the justice to say that his work as a whole is not marred by *apparent* bitterness. His style is always temperate and gentlemanly even when partisan.

To write a full criticism of his book would necessitate a running commentary, as faults of judgment abound on every page, and not a few of fact also exist. Take an instance. He says (p. 216): ''There is some question as to the authenticity of the words attributed to Boniface VIII: 'We wish you (Philip) to understand that you are subject to us in spirituals and in temporals.''' Some doubt? ''The forgery of this document'' (containing these words) ''is now, as Hefele says, universally acknowledged except by Huber.'' (Hergenröther's ''Church and State,'' Essay XI, § II.) But space will not allow us to go further. If the reader wishes us to

test the case for himself let him take the opening pages of Mr. Dunning's ninth chapter, which deals with Boniface VIII and read, as it were in parallel columns, the above mentioned eleventh Essay of Hergenröther's "Church and State" entitled "Boniface VIII and Philip the Fair." This is a crucial test. Boniface represents the extreme of papal claims, Philip the extreme of royal. Passion on both sides runs higher than at any other time. The whole questions of the relations between Church and State are exhaustively treated by both parties. It is then the best test case possible from an objective standpoint. Moreover it is among the best, if not the very best, piece of work in all of Mr. Dunning's book. And yet how one-sided is his whole treatment? By skilful manipulation of words he attains the same ends as the most malignant of anti-papal historians without using the savage expressions. It is a case of *suppressio veri*, of ambiguous expressions which can save the writer if he be attacked. Not a word of blame for the unspeakable outrages to which Boniface was subjected by the infamous Philip the "Unfair" and his agents Marigny, Nogaret, Paterine, Pierre Flotte, Plasian and Sciarra Colonna; of the shameless and absurd charges of heresy, sorcery, sodomy brought against the Pope in open Parliament; of that final outrage at Anagni on September 7, 1303, when Nogaret and Sciarra Colonna dragged Boniface from his palace, paraded him through the streets in derision, stole his treasures and left him half-famished. All this is seduously avoided. Philip throughout the chapter appears as an enlightened prince who was only seeking to safeguard the national honor of France from a foolish old pope, whereas in reality he was a tyrant no less to his people than to the Church. Our author takes care also to present always the views of the most extreme advocates on the Papal side, such as Ægidius Romanus and Augustinus Triumphus, although if the reader will consult Hergenröther¹ at note 2, p. 203, he will find that Ægidius Romanus is not quite as extreme as Dunning would have us believe. In fact all through his work the author seems to avoid as far as possible any exposition of the more moderate position known

¹ Op. cit.

as the "indirect power" of the pope over temporalities held by the majority of theologians, both modern and medieval.¹ By such a method one could very easily turn the tables and quote from only the most extreme advocates of the royal party. Again his expressions are ambiguous. On p. 218 he says that Augustinus Triumphus ascribed to the Pope *divine* attributes because Augustinus claimed for the Pope jurisdiction greater than that of an angel. Well! now! after all is not the Papal jurisdiction of *divine* origin according to Catholic belief? Was not the Bible of *divine* origin very largely? And with a modicum of common sense and fairness can we not easily recognize that this is all that Augustinus means by the *divinity* in the papal jurisdiction? And so it goes all along every line of the chapter which is radically and persistently disingenuous, as the reader will easily perceive by a parallel reading of Hergenröther.

To sum up. The present work, though brilliant in its way, cannot be accepted as anything better than an able exposé of one side of the complex question of medieval papal politics. It deliberately ignores or is ignorant of all the literature on the papal side and throughout skillfully presents the papal arguments in their worst light. As a gentlemanly onslaught against the medieval papacy it will find a hearty welcome among those readers to whom history is a lawyer's plea, all the more so as it carries along with it a pretentious apparatus of ex-parte literature and is written with an easy contemptuous elegance which Gibbon himself might envy.

A few closing remarks as to the future of historical writing on this subject. That a better spirit is upon us no one can doubt. It is surely a sign of the times when a publishing house like the Macmillans feels itself safe in entrusting to a Catholic priest the writing of one of its volumes of the Nations Series. And it is equally a sign of the times when Father Barry writes of the Papacy with such fearlessness. Yet the above researches are enough to show that much of the old leaven remains, enough to justify a warning.

Now the non-Catholic will forever be incapable of penning a fair history of the Medieval Empire so long as he refuses to

² Ib., 217-218.

recognize that the papacy was a tremendous moral force sustained by the faith of the people. Whether that faith was wrong or right is another question. As Mr. Tout very generously admits: "It was as the protectors of the people, not as the enemies of their political rights that the great Popes of the eleventh and twelfth centuries had obtained their wonderful ascendancy over the best minds of Europe" (327). Moreover it is undeniable that the Medieval Papacy was the soul and prime-mover certainly in every moral reform of any consequence and in almost every intellectual movement. It raised the priesthood out of the mire of feudalism, unaided by the Episcopate. It brought into life and sustained the Crusades. It was the only court of appeal capable of shielding a nation from the tyranny of a John or Philip Augustus. In a word it was the brains, the heart, the very soul of medieval civilization. Unless then this is granted the non-Catholic historian must necessarily lose his perspective and seek for other causes totally inadequate to explain the rise of the political power of the Papacy. To attempt to explain it by the aggressiveness of Hildebrand or the ingenuity of Innocent is begging the question. For how could such popes have succeeded in their aggression and ingenuity unless the spirit of the times was sympathetic and made such success a possibility. They had no armies of their own. They appealed always to law, Scripture, civil custom, conscience. And for centuries the world heeded that appeal. Is this not clear proof that their power fundamentally rested upon the faith and love of the masses? Mr. Hurter, even when a Protestant, felt the logic of this reflection.

"L'existence d'un pape du moyen age est un fragment de l'histoire universelle, et celle-ci, sans la clef de l'Eglise, perd cette base centrale, la source de cette vie qui circule dans toutes les parties du corps européen. . . . Il (Innocent III) avait le sentiment de la plus haute destination du Pontificat, la volonté de la réaliser, il la regardait comme une institution établie par Dieu lui-même pour la direction de l'Eglise et le salut du genre humain. Que la croyance qui le faisait agir, considérée en elle-même, soit vraie ou fausse . . . c'est une question . . . qui appartient à la polémique théologique, mais dont l'histoire n'a point à s'occuper. *Il suffit seulement à l'histoire de savoir que*

*cette croyance dominait à une certaine époque, et qu'elle se liait à une institution qui exerçait une souveraine et universelle influence . . . Parmi tous les hommes . . . nuls n'ont plus souvent éprouvé que les papes . . . le malheur d'être mal jugés, parce qu'ils l'ont été sans considérer, comme on le devait, le temps où ils ont vécu et les devoirs de leur charge.'*¹

Here is the whole difficulty in a nutshell. It is impossible to narrow the struggles of the Papacy with temporal sovereigns down to a squabble over temporalities, however much their quarrels took this form. It was a tremendous conflict of principles lying at the very foundation of society, and therefore nothing but a prevailing consciousness on the part of society that the popes represented right can explain the long supremacy of the Medieval Papacy in the face of the persistent and bitter protests of that same society against the wrong in it. The very failure of the Hohenstaufen legists, the Ghibelline poet Dante, of the lampoons and satires of Jacopone da Todi, the bolder speculations of Marsiglio of Padua, Wycliffe and Pierre Dubois—so many attempts to bring on the Reformation before its actual appearance—is undeniable proof that society revered and sustained the Papacy to the very last extreme of patience. Is it not all in the medieval mystic cry for a Papa Apostolico? Mr. Dunning, like most of his Protestant predecessors in this department of history, has completely missed this great and guiding fact. With all his apparent fairness and learning his work marks an advance in the study of history only so far as it necessarily moves along with the mere inertia of present-day historical investigation.

The second warning. Non-Catholic writers will continue to misunderstand the Papacy so long as they persist in accepting only one Catholic theory of Church and State as the theory of all Catholics. Now there have been and are now held by Catholics theories which allow the very widest freedom of opinion. Briefly, they are three: the direct, the indirect, the

¹ Hurter, III, pp. xxxv-xxxvii. In passing one cannot help recording with some amusement the contradiction of various writers when criticizing the Papacy. For instance Mr. Tout (p. 143) grows quite impatient with Paschal II: "the blundering Pope had betrayed the temporal possessions of the clergy and the necessary bulwarks of the freedom of the spiritual power." Yet other writers like Mr. Dunning blame them chiefly for defending their temporal possessions. Verily the Popes are between the devil and the deep sea of historical criticism!

directive. The direct gives the Pope direct, immediate authority over temporals, so that civil rulers are but the servants of the Church, receive their power from her and can be deposed for misconduct by her. The indirect gives the Church power over temporals only in so far as temporals intrench upon religion and thus in a way become spiritual concerns; the Church cannot depose a civil ruler but only declare obedience to him not binding whensoever that obedience becomes a menace to the Church, to spirituals. The directive allows the Church no constraining power whatsoever over temporals: in case of a conflict between her and civil authority she can only advise, confer, plead, and if these fail, then suffer patiently. Surely here is a great latitude for opinions, and, de facto, Catholic theologians have variously held them, the Church, not even in such apparently positive documents as the Bull "Unam Sanctam" of Boniface VIII and the Syllabus of Pius IX, having never officially taken sides on the question. The direct theory was maintained by a few men in the later Middle Ages, such as Henry of Segusia, Augustinus Triumphus, perhaps John of Salisbury and Thomas à Becket. The directive originated first with Gerson and afterwards with Fénelon. The indirect though even in the Middle Ages the most generally accepted theory, was formulated and developed most clearly by Cardinal Bellarmine. Of these three which has had the most vogue among Catholics? Certainly not the direct. It was maintained by only a few even in the Middle Ages and then only after the papal power had reached its full vigor. The indirect has most adherents in Europe, in fact is quite the vogue among Catholic theologians generally, and we do not see how any thinking man can regard it other than perfectly reasonable from a theoretical point of view. But in America where the diversity of religions has made us consider all questions affecting Church and State necessarily from a practical point of view, it is not unsafe to say that most Americans adopt the directive theory, Protestant Americans not less than Catholic.¹

¹ For a full exposition of these theories consult Hergenröther's "Church and State," II, Essay XIII, and Gosselin, II, pp. 359 et sq. Hergenröther favors the indirect theory, Gosselin is a disciple of Fénelon. Of the two Gosselin seems the more temperate in style and historical in treatment. Hergenröther is a pleader, though a masterly one. Gosselin *in re* is more of an historian.

Now, this being the case, is it not manifestly unfair for the average non-Catholic historian, like Mr. Dunning for instance, to pick out the weakest and least prevalent theory (the direct) to either say or imply that it is the official theory of the Church and then hold it up to scorn? To leave the wrong impression that the present-day church still maintains officially the right of deposing civil rulers and otherwise interfering in matters purely temporal, a right which she wisely forbears to attempt exercising now but which she hopes to exercise in the future? It is not said in so many words, but such is the impression created by his book and that of pretty much all others from the pens of English Protestants. As the reader sees it is a false one. From also this point of view then the work of Mr. Dunning is fundamentally defective, a defect due to his apparently complete ignorance of Catholic literature on his subject.

The above is written with a keen appreciation of the candor displayed by many non-Catholics when treating of the Medieval Papacy.¹ It is written with a still keener regret that we English-speaking Catholics should have produced so little that is worth reading, at least on this subject, and that many of us seem to fear telling the truth about the undeniable failures and faults of many popes. The Papacy itself, be it said to its credit, has deliberately condemned such timorousness and indifference. Leo XIII, in his brief of congratulation to Dr. Pastor, expressed an ardent wish that Catholics should write "*diligenter ac sincere*" de "*rebus gestis Pontificum Maximorum*." Still more recently he has told Father Mann that "*you must make the Popes known*" (*Bisogna far conoscere i Papi*). Let us then, to quote a hackneyed phrase, be up and doing, because we are surely doing very little, and let us do it sincerely and thoroughly. So long as we leave the field to non-Catholic critics we have none but ourselves to blame if they write of the Medieval Papacy with little sympathy, often with bigotry.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

¹ A casual reading of both Hergenröther and Gosselin will show a mass of testimonies from non-Catholic writers in favor of the Popes. Of the services rendered by the Papacy to Medieval Europe as an international tribunal see the remarkable article in the review "*La Papauté et les Peuples*" for September-October, 1902 (Paris). In the same article are quoted a number of writers on medieval papal politics by the side of whom it were well to place works like Mr. Dunning's and others simply by way of showing that works of their class are very rare in English.

SKEPTICISM AS A BASIS OF RELIGION.

In our review of Mr. Mallock's recent attack on the methods and arguments of our Catholic apologists for theism, we saw that, although he pronounces their reasoning to be worthless and even disgraceful, nevertheless, a cursory perusal of their works shows that in every case he has utterly failed to understand the position he attacks. Destructive criticism was not, however, the ultimate purpose of Mr. Mallock's excursion into the field of theistic Apologetics. His ulterior aim was to discover a reasonable basis for religious belief, and—the present bootless and ineffectual methods having been abandoned—to point out an intellectual road by which those thoughtful minds, whose faith had been shaken by the advance of scientific thought, may reach again a position of religious certainty.

In the present paper we shall consider Mr. Mallock's constructive attempt and note what measure of success he has achieved. In order to do this we must recall the fact that his constructive effort derives its whole significance from the conflict and contradiction which he alleges to exist between science and religion. It is only in the light of his unwarranted concessions to philosophic monism, that Mr. Mallock's theistic apology becomes intelligible. The substance of these concessions to the enemies of religion, as well as the whole trend of his destructive criticism, is conveniently and concisely epitomized in the following characteristic passage regarding the attitude of science towards the doctrine of human freedom; "Physiology," he tells us, "by its exposition of the facts and its establishment of the principle of heredity . . . has stopped the last earth in which the phantom of freedom could hide itself. It has supplied the last link in the chain by which man is bound to the mechanism of universal nature—has shown him to be part and parcel of one single and inexorable process, and no more responsible for any one of his thoughts or actions than he is for those of his grandfather, for the colour of his

eyes, or for the history and temperature of the earth which have rendered his life possible" (pp. 147-8).

In the light of this assertion one would naturally expect to find Mr. Mallock joining forces with Professor Haeckel in definitely consigning the doctrine of human freedom to the limbo of obsolete formulas. But nothing could be farther from his intentions. Having commemorated the "invulnerable" and "unimpeachable" arguments of monistic philosophers, he flatly denies their conclusions, and proceeds in the very teeth of positive science to "exhibit the doctrine of moral freedom as worthy of a reasonable man's acceptance."

In dealing with Mr. Mallock's defense of theism we must distinguish between a preliminary discussion, and the foundation of belief itself. The former consists of an abortive attempt to show that "contradictories—such as freedom and not-freedom—may be compatible." This contention, although entirely prefatory, is nevertheless absolutely essential to the favorable issue of Mr. Mallock's argument. For, unless freedom and not-freedom can be shown to be compatible in the same person, it would be the limit of absurdity to ask a reasonable man to give simultaneous assent to such mutually contradictory doctrines. This proposition, however, supposing it to be satisfactorily established, brings us only to the threshold of the theistic position; it shows that a belief in the doctrines of religion is not obviously irrational, that the conclusions of science should form no antecedent prejudice against the truth of theism; but it provides no positive ground for assent to religion. It is to the discovery and elaboration of this positive basis of religious belief that Mr. Mallock devotes the second portion of his argument. Here he reveals to our astonished gaze a moral order, a world of subjective values, altogether independent of the cosmic order, the world of scientific facts. And he points out that just as all our knowledge about the cosmic order is built on the judgment that the external world exists, so in like manner, our knowledge of the moral and religious order is based on the "judgment" that human progress, *i. e.*, the development of man's highest faculties, has a supreme significance. This instinctive "judgment" consti-

tutes the *practical basis* and reasonable warrant for an assent to each of the essential principles of theism, viz., moral freedom, human immortality, and an ethical God.

But since this basic "judgment" is an "instinctive and not a cognitive act," the question will arise, What grounds have we for imputing to it any objective validity? Mr. Mallock answers that we apprehend and accept this proposition regarding human progress by an act of instinctive faith essentially similar to the act by which we apprehend and accept the existence of the external universe. And of these mutually independent worlds—the cosmic world and the moral—the latter has always been, for the highest and strongest races, and must always continue to be, no less of a reality than the former. In the recognition of this fact, according to Mr. Mallock, lies the reasonable liberation of religious belief from the stifling limitations imposed on it by the recent progress and present conditions of scientific thought. Mr. Mallock's confidence that he has achieved success where, according to his own expression, the attempts made by the profoundest minds in all ages have been "ridiculous and ignominious failures," invites a separate consideration of the two steps which his argument comprises. The first in order is the *practical synthesis of contradictories*.

I.

Mr. Mallock makes no attempt to conceal the serious difficulties of the problem which, at the very outset, confronts him. On the one hand he accepts without demur the scientific disproof of moral freedom; he proposes to vindicate the reality of moral freedom, on the other. His first task, therefore, is to show that two contradictory propositions may both be true. This thesis Mr. Mallock does not profess to establish by a direct demonstration; what he proposes to do is to adduce numerous examples of "contradictions" involved in the most elementary religious and "scientific" beliefs, hoping thereby to convince the reader that, owing to the constitution of our own minds and of the universe, no coherent thought would be possible unless we were continually to give simultaneous assent to contradictions, not consciously, perhaps, but at least

by implication. If then, both the religious synthesis and the "scientific" are at bottom self-contradictory, and if, nevertheless, we may, as perfectly reasonable beings, persist in our belief in the reality either of the cosmic world or of the moral, there can be no antecedent reason why we should not assent to both at the same time: in a word, "no greater contradiction in thought is involved in a deliberate belief in the coexistence of the two incompatible worlds than is involved in a belief in the existence of either of these worlds separately" (p. 286).

It will make for clearness if we here state briefly a fact which will become more evident as we proceed, viz., that the formal fallacy in Mr. Mallock's attempt to prove his thesis by an appeal to alleged "contradictions" involved in the religious synthesis, lies in the double sense in which he uses the term "contradiction." He uses the term, first, in its proper sense, in which a proposition is said to contain a contradiction if it at once affirms and denies the same thing. In this sense, Mr. Mallock's thesis involves a contradiction. He uses the term, secondly, in an entirely improper sense, *i. e.*, he calls a proposition self-contradictory if only the human mind is incapable of harmonizing the subject and predicate in thought.

Such a proposition may properly be termed incomprehensible or inconceivable; but as John Stuart Mill pointed out, we should not be warranted in calling such a proposition "self-contradictory" unless "we knew *a priori* that we must have been created capable of conceiving whatever is capable of existing . . . an assumption more destitute of evidence could scarcely be made."¹ The supposed "contradiction" inherent in our religious concepts will be found to be, even on Mr. Mallock's own admission, not self-contradictory at all, but merely inconceivable.

Putting aside for the moment all consideration of the formal validity of his argument, let us observe a material implication of which, strangely enough, Mr. Mallock does not seem to have been aware. The assertion that a man may be morally-free and not-morally-free, at the same time, is clearly an explicit denial of the principles of contradiction, viz., that

¹ "Examination of Sir W. Hamilton's Philosophy," Vol. I, p. 85.

a thing cannot be and not-be at the same time. Now, one of the peculiar characteristics of the principle of contradiction is that it cannot be denied explicitly, without being at the same time affirmed implicitly; for the very denial loses all sense and meaning if it does not exclude the possibility that the principle is true. Furthermore, a disproof of the principle cannot be undertaken without, at each successive step, surreptitiously introducing the principle itself and assuming its truth. Thus, Mr. Mallock must of necessity implicitly repudiate in every sentence he writes, the very conclusion he professedly aims at establishing, and finally, when he has stated his conclusion in words, he has only succeeded in impaling himself on one or the other horn of this dilemma: either his conclusion is false, in which case his entire position collapses; or it is not false, and in that case—there being no repugnance between false and not-false—every word he utters, every sentence he frames, is reduced to the level of unmeaning gibberish. The naïveté with which Mr. Mallock sets about disproving the principle of contradiction is admirable. He is confident that if he only succeeds in disproving this principle, he will have pointed out a means whereby a man may reasonably assent both to the doctrines of religion and to the doctrines of “science” without any further unpleasant implications. He might as well propose to get rid of the principle of gravitation, and imagine that the only practical consequence of so doing would be that he could carry twice as heavy a burden as he was previously able to bear.

Mr. Mallock considers his position to be “sufficiently and conclusively illustrated by the admitted coexistence of sin and evil with a God who is all-good and all-powerful.” This example is not merely typical of the “contradictions” involved in our religious beliefs; it is, moreover, such a clear and undeniable illustration of his point that it stands in need of no further corroboration. So, at least, thinks Mr. Mallock. He has obviously failed to see that it devolves on him to show how the existence of sin logically involves a denial either of the goodness or of the omnipotence of God. Until this be established we cannot be justly accused of giving assent—even by

the remotest implication—to beliefs really contradictory. Such a demonstration, it is clear, cannot reasonably even be undertaken by any creature whose limited powers forbid his “grasping the scheme of things entire.” For “Who among men is he who can know the counsel of God? or who can say to him: Thou hast wrought iniquity”?

Not only can Mr. Mallock not show that this or any other essential doctrine of theism involves a denial of the principle of contradiction, but it never once crossed his mind to put forward so extravagant a claim. He admits freely that by “contradictions” he is here referring to propositions humanly inconceivable. Indeed, he sums up his remarks on this question by telling us that “that conception of God implies a co-existence of qualities in the same nature which cannot be reconciled by any other means than by a frank admission that this nature is *incomprehensible*” (p. 224). And he states explicitly that when he says contradictions need not be incompatible, he means “neither more nor less than . . . that the human intellect is an organ of *capacities so limited* that it is constitutionally unable to grasp life or existence in its totality” (p. 281). The source of Mr. Mallock’s error lies, therefore, not in attributing to an inconceivability the character of a real contradiction, but in paring down the content of the term “contradiction” until he destroys its nature. In a word, he fails to perceive that self-contradiction is a valid test of falsity, since it is an appeal to a positive power of the mind: while inconceivability, on the other hand, is not a criterion of falsity as it arises from a deficiency, an incapacity of the mind. If there remain any doubt that Mr. Mallock, instead of trying to prove that contradictions are compatible, has really been engaged in showing that inconceivability is not a test of falsity, it should be dispelled by reading the following passages from the last pages of his book. We have been “led astray” he tells, “by the idea that if two cognate beliefs are true, the human intellect must be able to attest their truth by reconciling them. . . . Let us only get rid of this utterly false idea that no two beliefs can be true which the intellect is unable to reconcile” (pp. 286-7), and we shall then with equal confidence be able to accept both monism and theism.

That inconceivability is no ultimate test of falsity has been a commonplace in Catholic philosophy for centuries. But, because the inconceivable may be true, it by no means follows that the self-contradictory may be true likewise. Yet, this is precisely Mr. Mallock's argument.

Before leaving this preliminary stage of the new Apology, we must advert briefly to Mr. Mallock's pseudo-"scientific" antinomies. As might have been anticipated, Mr. Mallock has here, again, erroneously identified Haeckel's monism with science. He points to the contradiction involved in the doctrine of a continuous ether, infinite in extent, out of which the existing universe arose by a process of condensation. This is not an established fact of science at all; it is not even a scientific hypothesis. Ether as a medium for the transmission of light, radiant heat, electricity, attraction and repulsion, is a proper enough subject for scientific theorizing. As long, however, as its very existence is hypothetical, there is nothing to prevent scientific philosophers like Haeckel from using it as a sort of school-boy's "*Asia Minor*" to which anything can be safely referred, if only its exact location is unknown. But is it not absurd to say that science has established "the three following facts: firstly, that the ether is the ultimate cause of all things; secondly, that it is homogeneous and non-atomic; thirdly, that it is capable of indefinite contraction and expansion" (p. 228)? Indeed, one need only glance through Mr. Mallock's pages (pp. 224-36) to be convinced that he is speaking of "contradictions" found, not in science, but in evolutionary monism. And in so far as he has pointed out real contradictions, he has simply dealt another blow to that already shattered mosaic of contradictions, which Professor Haeckel boastingly calls his "consistent and monistic theory of the eternal cosmogenetic process."

The same must be said of Mr. Mallock's analysis of the concepts of time and space. For, while the notion of "eternal time" and "infinite space," which he shows to be self-contradictory, are fundamental postulates with the monist, it is an affront to common sense to report reasonable beings as really believing that "time is divided by an ever-moving point,

the present, into two eternities—the past eternity and the future” (p. 236), or that actual space is infinite, and supposing it to be bisected by a plane, “each of the halves, being on one side infinite still, will, in respect of its spatial content, be no less infinite than the two taken together” (p. 237). That these propositions regarding time and space are really self-contradictory in the proper sense of the word, proves not that contradictories are compatible, but that time is not eternal and space is not infinite. To deny that it proves this is to deny the possibility of all proof—it is to *evict* reason.

There is no need of insisting further on the ineptitude of Mr. Mallock's attempt to show that we may, as reasonable beings, assent to the principles of monism, and at the same time assent to the principles of theism. At the beginning of the chapter in which he undertakes to perform this feat, Mr. Mallock remarks that, “To accept contradictory propositions as not in reality incompatible, is, (the reader) will say, a procedure which can seem reasonable to a madman only” (p. 219). At the end of the chapter the careful reader will be compelled in all honesty to admit that he has been strongly confirmed in his original opinion.

Consequently—since contradictions still remain incompatible—if science, as Mr. Mallock thinks, “forms an absolute affirmation of monism,” an inquiry into the second stage of his argument would clearly be a waste of time. We have seen, however, in our review of Mr. Mallock's destructive criticism, that “science in the sense of ‘rigorously verified fact’ repudiates evolutionary monism at every step.” Hence, we are not compelled *a priori* to regard the belief in God as a superstition, nor the belief in moral freedom as a subjective delusion. Our next concern, therefore, shall be with Mr. Mallock's attempt to discover a reasonable foundation, independent of science, for our religious convictions.

II.

The *practical basis* and justification of religious belief, according to Mr. Mallock, is to be found in certain instinctive “judgments” or appreciations of human worth, which, he maintains, “wholly escape the scrutiny of science.” These

“judgments” are capable of various expression: *e. g.*, as a belief in the dignity and sanctity of the individual human life: or as an instinctive assent to the proposition that human progress, *i. e.*, the development of man’s highest faculties, is invested with a supreme significance. This latter statement obviously embraces all other formulations of the basic judgment, for as Mr. Mallock himself points out, “human progress will have no significance at all, unless the individual has some personal destiny beyond that of being sacrificed to a purpose in which he is not himself included” (p. 252). The *practical basis* of religious belief is therefore found to lie in an instinctive “judgment” of mankind that *human progress has a meaning*.

Before the skeptical mind will acquiesce in the sufficiency of this foundation of belief, it will propound several anxious questions which press for a definite answer: First: Has Mr. Mallock succeeded in showing that the doctrine of human freedom, which lies at the heart of the theistic position, is actually involved in the moral and social development of the human race? Second: As a matter of fact, is not our belief in the meaning of human progress derived from the very doctrines of theism, which Mr. Mallock is attempting to bolster up with it, *i. e.*, is not Mr. Mallock’s whole Apology a glaring example of *petitio principii*? Third: Is this belief really independent of science—and, if not, does not Mr. Mallock stand self-convicted of failure by the fact that he is trying to “meet science on its own ground”? Fourth, and perhaps most important: If this basic judgment be an instinctive, not a cognitive act, what grounds have we for supposing it to be objectively valid? On the answer given to these questions must rest one’s estimate of the value of Mr. Mallock’s contribution to the literature of theistic Apology. We shall consider them briefly, beginning with the first.

1. In establishing the doctrine of human freedom, Mr. Mallock does not pretend to show that it is *logically* involved in the very concept of human progress. What he proposes to establish is that the belief in freedom is *practically* required as an essential condition for the moral and social development of the human race. This belief—so he argues—engenders

conscience and a sense of moral responsibility: and without these, progress is simply impossible. For, "there is no more effective instrument of self-restraint in existence than the knowledge on a man's part that, if he acts in a certain way, he will have to submit to his own condemnation of himself" (p. 246). If, on the contrary, man once becomes convinced that not he, but nature whose creature he is, is responsible for his acts—"self-condemnation will be impossible, his whole dread of it will be gone, and one entire side of his moral self will be paralyzed." But this is not all. "Besides losing our power of condemning ourselves or others," continues Mr. Mallock, "we shall lose our power of esteeming ourselves or others, likewise. All the higher developments of friendship, love, and admiration would sink into the same grave that has engulfed condemnation and hatred" (p. 247). In a word, eliminate our belief in moral freedom, and you strike from human consciousness the source from which spring all the higher, the deeper, the more delicate, the more interesting elements in life. If we were deprived of the belief that we are free, we should lose our chief reason for acting and thinking after that peculiar fashion which constitutes human progress: we should lose the motive which *determines* our will to choose what is good and elevating, in preference to what is bad and debasing.

In fact, for human development, according to Mr. Mallock, the belief in freedom must be present, as a motive for action; but the possession of real freedom is by no means essential; it would, on the contrary, be highly undesirable. For, since a free being is "more than the agent of motives" there is nothing to keep him from imperilling human progress by "acting like a drunken man" without motive. Hence man must be beguiled into acting for his highest interests by a pleasant fiction, which, *to be effective must be delusive*. "Ut pueris olim dant frustula blandi doctores." Expunge our belief in freedom whilst leaving us the reality, and you eliminate all the more valuable elements in life: civilization would decay, the sky of human progress would be forever overcast. But if, on the other hand, we were deprived of real freedom whilst

fondly believing ourselves possessed of it, human intercourse would lose none of its zest and significance. Such are the implications of Mr. Mallock's argument. It should be clear that this line of reasoning would at best prove that the *belief* in moral freedom is a practical prerequisite of human progress: but as regards the correspondence of this belief with objective reality—which is the only question at issue—it does not enable us to form the remotest conjecture.

It is important to observe that the objective validity of this belief is not enhanced by the fact that human progress is insinct with meaning. For whether human progress have any significance or not, it is only the belief in freedom that is involved as a practical prerequisite. The only advantage Mr. Mallock's supposition possesses over its rival is that, if human progress really has a meaning, it is not *obviously irrational* to suppose that man is free, as it would be on the contrary assumption.

The question-begging character of Mr. Mallock's defense of freedom may be plainly discerned in the following compendious statement: "If we do but succeed in showing that this one doctrine of freedom is really essential to life as men are resolved to live it, we shall have established in theory everything for which we are now contending" (p. 248). In other words our belief in freedom is valid because it is essential to life as men are resolved to live it. But why are men resolved to live in this particular way? Because, forsooth, they believe in human freedom and responsibility—as Mr. Mallock has been at such pains to show. And why do they believe in human freedom? Because they are resolved to live a certain fashion, and the belief in freedom is practically essential to that life. Thus we are led round and round in a circle incurably vicious.

One is by no means prepared to admit that Mr. Mallock has proven even the belief in moral responsibility to be a necessary condition of human development, moral, intellectual, or social. So eminent an authority as Dr. Martineau is of opinion¹ that an impartial observer would probably find more

¹ "A Study of Religion," Vol. II, p. 186.

striking examples of moral greatness in the ranks of the Determinists than in those of the Libertarians. Without assenting to this somewhat extreme view we may recall the fact that, in the ancient world, the name of "Stoic" was synonymous with high-mindedness and prudence and moral integrity. Yet the Stoics were Determinists. In more recent times the self-restraint and austerity of the Puritan type of character has become proverbial; but the Puritans, it is well known, did not believe in human responsibility. And the people of the far East, are they not fatalists? Still it cannot be denied that great rulers and empires, and even great systems of thought, have arisen among them.

Enough has been said to make it evident that Mr. Mallock's practical basis of belief furnishes no warrant for the objective validity of the belief in human freedom. His view of the entire theistic problem is identical with that of Voltaire; "although there be no God, we should have to create Him—although physiology has established as a fact of positive knowledge that man is no more responsible for his acts than he is for the acts of his grandfather, still we should embrace the delusive belief that we are free in order to make life bearable." Hence, it is to be feared that Mr. Mallock's solution for the theistic problem will prove unsatisfactory even to that limited and anomalous class of readers for whose express benefit it was excogitated, *i. e.*, for "those who are doubtful of the religious view or deny it; but who in doubting or denying it, do so *against their will* and are looking about them in vain for some intellectual road by which they may reach again a position of religious certainty" (p. 3).

2. We have seen that Mr. Mallock has failed to derive the reality of human freedom from the judgment that "human progress is invested with deep significance." (This basic judgment is for the moment accepted as objectively valid.) We must not, however, be understood to imply that no logical connection exists between the two doctrines; but that the connection which exists between them is the reverse of what Mr. Mallock imagines it to be. The fact is that the doctrine of moral freedom is a logical antecedent of the doctrine that

human progress has a meaning. This is admitted by Mr. Mallock himself in at least one passage, in which he tells us that the doctrine of human freedom is a "latent supposition" without which it would be impossible for us to believe that any value inheres in what human beings do or are (p. 248). And this must be admitted by everyone who reflects on the subject, that—supernatural revelation apart—our main warrant for the belief that human development is instinct with meaning, lies in a previous conviction that we are free agents morally responsible for our actions.

But, although the doctrine of moral freedom is logically prior to the belief in the worth of human progress, it is not an immediate premise to that belief. It is not even a necessary presupposition, and for a very simple reason, viz., that the belief in the immortality and spiritual dignity of man, which constitutes the intermediate step between the doctrine of freedom and the doctrine that progress has a meaning, may be established on grounds other than that of moral freedom; *e. g.*, it may be arrived at from a consideration of the intellectual activities of man. Our knowledge of human immortality is the immediate logical antecedent of our knowledge that human progress is invested with meaning. Moreover, unlike the doctrine of moral freedom, it is an absolutely necessary antecedent. A moment's consideration will make this evident. A reasonable assent to a proposition requires that some evidence—intrinsic or extrinsic—be presented in support of the proposition. In the present case, the only extrinsic evidence which could command our assent, must ultimately be divine revelation. But divine revelation presupposes the existence of God. Hence, the belief in the meaning of human progress, if it is to constitute a *basis*, "a firm intellectual basis of religious belief" (p. 284), must compel our assent on grounds of intrinsic evidence, *i. e.*, it must be either self-evident or logically inferred from some proposition to which we have previously assented. Now, surely Mr. Mallock will not maintain that the supreme worth of human life is self-evident. On such a supposition it would be impossible to explain the stubborn conviction of millions of

Buddhists that the essence of all existence, especially of sentient and rational existence, is evil. Nor does the "splendid purpose" of human development seem self-evident to those other millions who have been ground down in the competitive struggle for the bare necessities which sustain life. On the contrary, were they not supported by a belief in God and human immortality they would be forced to echo the sentiment expressed by Sophocles: "Not to have been born at all is the happiest fate, and the next best is to die young." The truth is that the principles of theism alone are our reasonable warrant for reprobating the pessimism inherent in the doctrines of Haeckel's pseudo-scientific monism—according to which the individual human life is a colorless fragment of a soulless universe. No one would seem to recognize this fact more clearly than did Mr. Mallock when he wrote: "Progress or evolution will have no significance at all unless the individual has some personal destiny beyond that of being sacrificed to a purpose in which he is not included" (p. 252). This is clearly an avowal that the doctrine of human immortality must be admitted before we can have any knowledge of the value or meaning of development. It is self-evident that, when this relation exists between two doctrines, the former is not derived from the latter, but vice versa. Hence, Mr. Mallock's whole attempt to base the principles of theism on the belief in the meaning of human progress is a flagrant *petitio principii*.

It may be objected that Mr. Mallock has obviated the force of this criticism by expressly stating that this basic judgment or belief is not an act of reason at all, but an act of pure will, or instinct. Therefore, it might be argued, this act has nothing whatever to do with the appreciation of evidence, and consequently is not amenable to the rules of reason. To quote the words of Mr. Mallock himself: "Life presents to us two great orders of things. One of them is the cosmos, or the world of objective facts. The other is the moral world, or the world of subjective values. . . . The cosmic world we interpret by the exact methods of science, and the results are such that an acceptance of them is *forced by the evidence* on our judgment,

the judgment itself being passive. . . . The moral world we interpret by standards which we supply ourselves, and our judgment is not passive but active. . . . It is easy to see that here, where the *standard of truth is a variable*, no science strictly so-called can exist" (p. 272).

Mr. Mallock's contention comes to this; judgments of worth do not involve any action characteristic of the intellect, but possess a subjective validity of their own independently of the avouchment of the reasoning faculty that they represent objective reality. If this claim could be made good, Mr. Mallock's position would not be so obviously obnoxious to the charge of question-begging. An assertion, however, more arbitrary and more destitute of foundation could not well be conceived of. As we shall see presently, even Mr. Mallock himself is forced to admit that the validity of a value-judgment depends on its correspondence to objective fact.

3. Mr. Mallock's objection to contemporary methods of religious defense was that our apologists attempt to "meet science on its own ground." We were, therefore, led to expect that the basis of belief to be proposed by Mr. Mallock would lie outside of the domain of science. We have just seen how he has attempted to carry out this project by drawing a hard and fast line between the world of objective facts and the world of subjective values. Our concern now is to inquire whether this distinction is well-founded. Is it true that the validity of moral "judgment of value" is altogether independent of theoretical "judgments of existence"? This question can be best answered by a consideration of those very judgments of value in which Mr. Mallock finds the practical basis of theism. "Science," he tells us, "can offer no opinion as to the truth of the belief in the sanctity of human life" (p. 243). And again: "We are brought to the chief and to the last of those questions with regard to which science can tell us nothing, viz., Is the spiritual, intellectual, and social development of the human race a fact which has any meaning or has it none? This is a question which cannot be answered by an appeal to external evidence. It can be answered only by an act which is at once an act of belief, of common sense

and of will, an act which for practical purposes, creates the truth it affirms" (p. 259). In the first place, is there no judgment of existence involved in the assertion that human life possess sanctity? To possess sanctity is to have a certain spiritual worth. Now it cannot be asserted that a combination of material particles, no matter how skillfully organized, by the action of physical forces, has spiritual worth. The only thing that can have spiritual worth is a spiritual subject that *exists*. Secondly, let us consider the assertion that "human progress has a supreme significance." The expression "human progress" may be taken in two senses. By progress the evolutionary monist would understand merely a continuous change resulting in an increasing complexity of structure and diversity of function—a readjustment of matter and motion. In this sort of progress there is no qualitative difference between higher and lower. If we suppose this to be a true description of human development, then, as Mr. Mallock says: "What we have been accustomed to call the highest development of humanity are in no objective sense higher than what we call the lowest" (p. 273). But when Mr. Mallock speaks of human progress as having a meaning, he refers to something quite different. He refers to a process of development in which the higher is qualitatively and eternally superior to the lower. This, he tells us, is the only sense in which human progress can be said to have supreme value. Hence, Mr. Mallock has plainly involved himself in a contradiction. He assured us, first that the standard of truth for value-judgments is entirely subjective: and now he admits that the most important of all such judgments—"the one which embraces all others" (p. 259), depends for its validity upon the correspondence of its subject, viz., human progress, with objective reality. If what we have "been accustomed to call the highest development of humanity are in no objective sense, higher than what we call the lowest," then it is clear that human progress can have no particular worth. Whence we conclude that this judgment of value, like the former one concerning the sanctity of human life, involves a scientific, *i. e.*, intellectual, judgment of the objective existence of its subject.

And what is true of these two is obviously true of all judgments of value whatsoever. If they are not to be mere "air-drawn" formulas, the subject of predication must have real existence.

It must not be inferred from this that Mr. Mallock's argument is to be rejected because—contrary to his opinion—it involves an act of reason. Quite the reverse. What we wish to make plain is that Mr. Mallock has been unable to discover any defense of theism which does not involve a judgment of the intellect, and consequently that he is illogical in clinging to this particular argument whilst rejecting the numerous other arguments for theism which have precisely the same basis. Indeed this very argument which Mr. Mallock employs, has been familiar to Catholic philosophers, time out of mind. But they were careful to provide for it a valid foundation, and to recognize that, at best, it is of a supplementary character. The source of Mr. Mallock's error lies, first, in overlooking the subordinate character of the argument, and secondly, in repudiating the foundation on which it depends for its validity. We have already seen his denial of the principle of contradiction. Our next concern is with his attempt to make a non-rational motive the sole basis of theistic belief.

4. We have now arrived at our fourth and final inquiry regarding Mr. Mallock's Apologetics, viz., what grounds have we for supposing that this basic "judgment" itself corresponds to objective reality? A conclusion possesses no more validity than its premises. In order, therefore, that we may have a reasonable basis for believing in the doctrines of theism, we must be assured of the validity of the belief on which they are founded.

The act by which we assent to this fundamental proposition, Mr. Mallock tells us, is an instinctive, not a cognitive act. "It is an act of belief, of common sense, and of will, which for practical purpose creates the truth it affirms" (p. 259). To begin with, this marvellous act of will is not an act of belief or judgment, in any proper sense, at all. The act of assent necessarily demands an intellectual element. A reasoned atheist cannot be a deliberate, a voluntary, theist. As Professor

Flint excellently points out, "There is no mere 'will to believe.' A merely willed belief is a sham belief, no real belief."¹

If this sham belief is the only basis we have for our assent to the doctrine of theism and the principles of the moral order, there is nothing left for us but moral skepticism. It is small consolation to be told this act of the will "for practical purposes creates the truth it affirms," if the fact stands that all the evidence is against the validity of this belief. "All the facts of the universe, mental and physical," Mr. Mallock tells us, "form an absolute affirmation of monism which is fatal to each of the essential doctrines of religion." We have, therefore, not the slightest knowledge, direct or indirect, of the existence of the moral world. We cannot even legitimately guess that it exists. In such a condition, to will to believe that human progress has more than an ephemeral value, that human life is more than

A moment's halt—a momentary taste,
Of being from the well amid the waste,

would be an act of mental dishonesty, productive only of a subjective delusion—an act properly reprobated by every reasonable man.

To make confusion worse confounded, Mr. Mallock proceeds to justify this act of mental duplicity, by telling us that our assent to the existence of the cosmic world is consummated by a similar act of self-deception. The external world, he says, is not apprehended by a cognitive act, for "the senses merely give men certain internal ideas . . . and reason instead of supporting the inference that the causes (in which these ideas originate), must be external objects, entirely fails, as all thinkers now admit, to assure us of the existence of anything outside our individual selves" (p. 275). The act by which we apprehend and accept the comic world is instinctive, not cognitive. Consequently there is no evidence known to us for the existence of the external world, nor does Mr. Mallock venture to assert that in case of external existence, the instinctive act, by which we assent to it, will "create the

¹ "Agnosticism," p. 453.

truth it affirms"—even "for practical purposes." Mr. Mallock had in mind to confirm us in the delusion that a moral world exists; what he had accomplished is to leave our belief in the reality of the external world not a leg to stand on. In trying to extricate himself from the unsavory implications of moral skepticism, he has hopelessly entangled himself in the meshes of universal skepticism.

Not only does his practical basis of theistic belief involve the denial of the slightest knowledge on our part, concerning even the existence either of the moral order, or of the cosmic; it involves, likewise, a denial of the validity of the reasoning process. For not only does reason not make the external world known to us, but "it is a guide, if we follow it faithfully, not to belief but to skepticism" (p. 276). Hence, in order to perform the act of instinctive belief by which we assent to the existence of external objects, we must repudiate the cogency of logical inference and condemn the intellectual faculty as untrustworthy. Since our cognitive faculties are thus unreliable we cannot even remotely conjecture that we ourselves exist. The *eviction* of reason, in the name of reason, is complete. In his argument for theism Mr. Mallock has found it necessary to rest the cornerstone of his new edifice on a triple foundation, viz., first, a denial of the principle of contradiction; second, a denial of the trustworthiness of our cognitive faculties; and third, a denial of the validity of the reasoning process. Such is "the firm intellectual basis of religious belief"—such is the "intellectual road" by which Mr. Mallock proposes to enable the honest doubter to "reach again a position of religious certainty"!

It is fortunate for the cause of religion that Mr. Mallock has not been more successful in his attack on the existing methods of theistic Apology than he has been in his attempt to construct a new and more stable basis for religious belief. For, in view of his "ridiculous and ignominious failure" to discredit those lines of religious defense which are traditional in Catholic philosophy, we may still safely persevere in our religious convictions.

While Mr. Mallock has failed to provide a new basis for the doctrines of theism, it cannot be denied that his study of the theistic problem will have a beneficial influence on contemporary Apologetics. It is valuable, however, not for its contribution to the defense of religion, but rather as a sign of warning against a prevailing tendency in present day Apologies for theism, viz., the tendency to discredit and minimize the rational element in religious assent, and to emphasize unduly the non-rational element. The absurd extreme to which Mr. Mallock has carried this tendency will doubtless do something to restore the study of the basis of religious assent to saner and safer methods.

EDWIN V. O'HARA.

ACADEMY OF APOLOGETICS,
ST. PAUL SEMINARY.

BOOK REVIEWS.

History of Philosophy. By William Turner, S.T.D. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. x + 674.

The modern demand for good text-books has been met in nearly all departments of knowledge and even in those sciences which are known as "philosophical." That in this line of production American scholarship has been peculiarly successful is a fact that is in keeping with the practical tendencies of our country. But hitherto the history of philosophy has been accessible mainly in the form of translations from the German. American manuals are rare. Were utility the only criterion, the present work is timely; Dr. Turner has given us an excellent text-book.

Viewing the book as a whole one notes, as its salient features, clearness, conciseness and proportion. The task of presenting within narrow limits the essentials of the various systems is not easy; and it is still more difficult to give each its due share of exposition. In both respects, Dr. Turner has succeeded. The result is especially important for mediæval philosophy. Scholasticism, which has so often been hurried over with scant justice by historians, appears in its true character; and its relations to earlier systems and to modern philosophy are well defined. That the work of Schoolmen should receive sympathetic treatment from a Catholic writer, was to be expected. But this sympathy does not prevent our author from discovering the merit in other philosophers whose teachings are far removed from the thought and the principles of Scholasticism. The treatment throughout is marked by calm objective appreciation.

The brief introduction which precedes each of the larger divisions, the references to the literature under each chapter and the statement of each philosopher's historical position, are details of method which will prove helpful to the student. Much care has also been taken in bringing out, under separate paragraphs with appropriate headings, the more important topics and in grading the print so as to show at a glance the relative value of the points under discussion.

The book commends itself to all who are interested in the study of philosophy. The beginner will find in it just that outline of history which he needs; and the more advanced student will be encouraged by its suggestions and indications to a deeper investigation

of those problems which, in our day as in the past, have called out the energies of truly great minds.

EDWARD A. PACE.

The Pope and the People. Select letters and addresses on Social Questions. By His Holiness Pope Leo XIII. New and Revised edition. New York: Benziger, 1903.

Les Béatitudes De L'Evangile et Les Promesses De La Démocratie Sociale. Par Mgr. Schmitz. Traduit par l'abbé L. Colin. Paris: Lethielleux, 1903. Pp. 320.

Les Grevés. Par Léon de Seilhac, Bibliothèque d'économie sociale. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. Pp. 257.

Cartells et Trusts. Par E. Martin Saint-Léon, Bibliothèque d'économie sociale. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. Pp. 248.

1. The Catholic Truth Society has rendered a real service to students of the social questions who are interested in the Catholic point of view, in publishing for us in a popular form the most important social encyclicals of the Holy Father.

The volume before us contains the three papal letters of 1878, 1891, and 1901, on socialism and social democracy; one addressed to a delegation from the workingmen's clubs of France, and the letters on liberty, marriage, the reunion of Christendom, the duties of Christians as citizens, and the Christian life.

An introduction to the collection is written by Mr. Devas; the paragraphs throughout are synopsized on the margin of the page. There is a good table of contents. In this form these important documents are accessible to all students. There is no reason why the collection should not be widely circulated among students and Catholics in the United States.

2. The author of this work was the well-known coadjutor bishop of Cologne who died in 1899. His great and intelligent interest in the coöperation with social reform wherever his priestly ministrations brought him, won for him the title *der soziale Bischof*. As an organizer leader and orator he was especially gifted.

In the volume before us we find a devotional commentary on the Beatitudes and a comparison for purpose of criticism between them and what we may call the socialist beatitudes. The spirit and point of view in the work are traditional; much stress is laid on conditions in life and possibly too little on personal or individual superiority to them. For instance we find riches and the rich generally condemned, poverty and the poor generally lauded: the vices of the rich and the

virtues of the poor are brought to our attention, while the virtues of the rich and the vices of the poor largely escape notice. The little volume is useful, as far as a devotional commentary can be useful, but it would serve the cause of reform much more effectually were it to stimulate the sense of personal responsibility more and emphasize less external conditions.

3. This volume on strikes contains a comprehensive survey of conditions in France, of the relation of the strike to the civil law, the socialistic attitude, the documents concerning a number of recent strikes, and the various forms of strikes in France. The concluding portion of the volume contains a digest of the laws on conciliation and arbitration. The book is full of positive information which is, of course, interesting to students of strike problems.

4. M. Saint Léon presents in this volume a comprehensive review of the trust problem. He has taken into account all the available recent literature produced in Germany, Austria, France and the United States, and has made a clear, concise résumé of information bearing on the origin, history, structure, financeering, advantages and the evils of trusts, together with the legislation concerning them. It is the first work of the kind in French, so far as we know.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Synopsis Theologiæ Moralis. I. De Pœnitentia, Matrimonio, Ordine. Ad. Tanquery, S. S. Paris: 1903. 8°, pp. 628 and 33.

This is the first of a series of volumes on Moral Theology, that are owing to the scholarly pen of Dr. Tanquery, formerly professor in St. Mary's Seminary at Baltimore. Readers of the BULLETIN are acquainted with his manual of Dogmatic Theology. (Cf. ———.)

The volume before us is intended as a text-book, comprising, as it does, the lectures which the author has regularly given in the seminary. He follows in general the traditional line, writing under the guidance of standard theologians. There is, of course, not much opportunity for newness in the doctrines on penance, matrimony, and orders, once the historical point of view is excluded. How that point of view may be yet introduced into doctrinal treatises intended for seminary use, is still a problem. Otherwise, the work is up to date, and its ample bibliography shows a wide acquaintance with the most recent literature, especially in English. Two characteristics will commend this volume to students: the author has abandoned the framework of casuistry, and he has embodied many practical suggestions bearing on the active work of the ministry. The style throughout is

direct and clear, and the treatment of subjects is complete. The work will serve admirably its purpose as a text-book for seminarians.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Our Benevolent Feudalism. By W. J. Ghent. New York: Macmillan, 1903. 3d edition.

This volume has had the interesting fate of having been warmly welcomed and greatly abused by reviewers. The early third edition gives evidence of the fact that at any rate it has been widely read. The author in the preface to this edition gives us an amusing résumé of the reviews which the work has received. It contains a history and a prophecy; a review of present industrial political and social conditions, and a prediction concerning the benevolent feudalism which is to succeed the actual organization of society. As a review of tendencies it is surely interesting, even eloquent, yet it may not satisfy serious students, and may mislead the superficial. Prophecy is generally valuable in inverse ratio to its quantity and assurance. It is difficult to believe with the author that the future state predicted will be the logical outcome of actual tendencies, or, being the logical result of actual tendencies, that it will be realized. History does not run along the lines of logic. Nor is it necessary to believe with the author that there is no middle term between the coöperative commonwealth and benevolent feudalism.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Question-Box Answers: Replies to questions received on missions to non-Catholics. By Rev. Bertrand L. Conway of the Paulist Fathers. New York: The Catholic Book Exchange, 1903. 8°, pp. v + 589.

In his preface to this book Cardinal Gibbons states that it "answers in a brief and popular manner the most important questions actually received by the author during the past five years of missionary activity in all parts of the United States from Boston to Denver." These words of praise are weighty, coming as they do from one who has himself prepared a work of the same nature, long since become one of the most popular books of the nineteenth century. Fr. Conway gathers under more than sixty titles a multitude of objections received by the Diocesan Missionaries on their apostolic tours here and there in the United States. Not all of them affect immediately the special tenets of Catholicism. The rule of faith, the "notes" of the true Church, politico-ecclesiastical matters, peculiar institutions of Catholicism like celibacy, abstinence, fasting and

indulgences, come in for a large meed of explanation. The Mass, the Sacraments, the Blessed Virgin and the Saints, the life to come, are other sources of ignorance or misunderstanding. It is remarkable to what an extent these average objections of the non-Catholic mind square with the original polemics of Protestantism in the sixteenth century, or when they are new, are nearly all drawn from erroneous views of the great lines of the history of the Church. It needs no profound work like Moehler's *Symbolism* to grapple with this material—one would think after reading the book that the average American mind had been little touched by the advanced Protestant theological literature of the last two centuries. If these objections really represent the elements of religious doubt and hesitation in the American mind as regards Catholicism, there is reason for believing the assertion of Mr. Henry Sidgwick in a late issue of the "*Atlantic Monthly*," viz., that there is no longer any insurmountable doctrinal obstacle to the reunion of the Protestant churches with the Roman Church on the basis of her actual teaching. There are other instructive thoughts suggested by the examination of these curious statistics.

This little catechism may rightly hope to become a popular vademecum. Its place is already marked in the average Catholic home library besides the "*Faith of Our Fathers*" and the "*Catholic Doctrine*" of Faa di Bruno not to speak of older works like Hay's "*Sincere Christian*" and Milner's "*End of Controversy*." The style is quite suitable to the scope of the work—direct, clear, and simple. There is a sustained effort to make known frankly and sufficiently the elements of Catholic truth and discipline in a diction that avoids theological phraseology without losing fulness and precision. The writer does not try to say all that might be said, but only what is needed to make clear the immediate vision of his opponent or disciple. Such a book is equipped to take care of itself, to be its own tongue, its own commentary. Its circulation should therefore be an unlimited one. Improvements will no doubt be suggested. Thus, the titles of all books cited are indeed printed in a special bibliography, but they might be again grouped with others in a logical order, to furnish a course of regular and progressive reading in Catholic theology and history. The titles of chapters ought to be numbered both in the text and in the table of contents, and with this might be combined a progressive numbering of all the paragraphs. Where an index-subject includes several references, it might be well to introduce the practice of indicating in heavier type the page or pages where an objection is most efficiently dealt with.

Finally, we cannot help suggesting that a companion volume of "Select Readings" be issued, drawn, when possible, from eloquent non-Catholic writers, and by cross-references made to act as a companion or key to certain important lines of objection. We wish Father Conway and his co-laborers an ever-growing measure of success in the immense vineyard that has been allotted to them. Here grow brambles, it is true, and here are the ruins of a rich cultivation—but here also are fertile soil, abundant sap, racy if wild fruit, the traces of former success and comfort, consoling and inspiriting evidences of former unity and communion. Only the persistent and ingenious husbandry of charity may hope to reclaim these lost provinces from the moral desolation that has fallen or is impending over them—but it is precisely in Catholicism that the Almighty has planted the inexhaustible reservoir of charity, as wide as the world and humanity, and as inexhaustible as the divine love itself.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Teaching of History and Civics in the elementary and the secondary school. By Henry E. Bourne. New York: Longmans, 1902. 8°, pp. 385.

Professor Bourne has earned the gratitude of teachers by this useful compilation. In it is to be found good instruction as to the origins of historical scholarship, the progress of historical teaching in Europe and the United States, the value and scope of historical teaching, the choice of books and of subject-matter, the methods of teaching. Skeleton courses are then mapped out for the study of ancient, mediæval and modern history. As a handbook or guide the work will render excellent service in the higher grades of our schools. It is especially useful to teachers. Its tone is habitually respectful towards Catholicism. The writer betrays a varied learning, good judgment, and a liberal historical training that enables him to deal largely and philosophically with our human experience, also to point out to the non-Catholics who read his book certain pitfalls into which they are easily led by inherited prejudice.

At the same time we cannot but regret the want of a similar work written by a Catholic hand. The history of humanity takes on another appearance when written from the viewpoint of the Catholic Church. Problems, ideas, institutions, that seem of slight or remote interest to the non-Catholic mind, are of importance to us. We look on the Church as a divine and perfect society, and on the other world as her terminus ad quem. Our sympathies go out naturally to her great chiefs, and we seize with a subtle instinct certain super-national

principles and tendencies that are foreign or abhorrent to non-Catholics. As to bibliography we are aware of many excellent works, in our own and in other tongues, that the non-Catholic seldom hears of, or perhaps traces with some difficulty. There is, perhaps no work more needed for our Catholic colleges seminaries and academies than an introduction to the study of history, particularly of mediæval and modern history, written from our domestic standpoint. Indeed until we have produced such a work with its pertinent bibliographies, we cannot very well complain if our Catholic historical literature is left in the background. Our own modesty is often the cause of such a neglect.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Three Letters of Philoxenus, Bishop of Mabbôgh (485-519), being the letter to the monks, the first letter to the monks of Beth-Gaugal, and the letter to the Emperor Zeno. Edited from Syriac MSS. in the Vatican Library, with an English translation, an introduction to the life works and doctrines of Philoxenus, a theological glossary and an appendix of bible quotations, by Arthur Adolph Vaschalde, Member of the Society of the Priests of St. Basil, Licentiate of Theology. A dissertation presented to the Faculty of Philosophy of The Catholic University of America for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Printed at Rome, Tipografia della R. Accademia dei Lincei, 1902. 8°, pp. xv + 190.

Disruption and dissolution are written large over the latter half of the fifth century of Roman imperial history and the Christian era. In the civil order the barbarian dominated the West, and threatened the seat of empire itself. In the religious order the subtlest consequences of Arianism were in various ways working themselves out in heresies that borrowed a curious viability from the confused political surroundings and from a "renouveau" of national sentiment that had long been smothered or offset in Egypt and Syria. The results of these revolutions were far-reaching. To no small extent the modern world comes down in direct line from the conditions outlined by the immediate predecessors of Justinian (527-565), and consolidated in his long and memorable reign. Great bodies of Christians were cut off, from both imperial and religious unity as in the case of the Nestorians, and from orthodox communion as in the case of the Monophysites. They could not but take with them many precious heirlooms of ecclesiastical belief and discipline—our polemical theology goes back frequently to their ancient creeds and praxis for con-

firmation of Catholic teaching. They also took with them old Christian systems of education, valuable libraries, habits of theological defence and attack, a knowledge of the dialectic and the rhetoric of the schools, and useful traditions of secular knowledge. And while it is true that the life-sap of unity no longer flowed in these immense decaying branches, it is also true that for centuries they lived with a measure of success and prestige on the provisions they took away from the vast stores of Byzantine life and learning. Indeed, it was through them that Arabic Islam learned how to administer the civilization it had conquered, and even competed one day with the Christian Orient on its own ground and in its own beloved sciences.

Readers of Duval's "*Histoire de la Littérature Syriacque*" (Paris, 2d ed., 1900) do not need to be told to what extent that rich department of Christian learning is dependent on the writings of the Monophysite scholars of the fifth and sixth centuries. As the Council of Trent roused every Protestant pen to opposition, so the Council of Chalcedon (451) roused to manifold activity, not only the immediate followers of Eutyches but the more dangerous and numerous body who read in the outcome of the Council a challenge to both Alexandria and Antioch. From both quarters came a response in the shape of polemico-theological literature, but bilingual Syria bore for several reasons, the brunt of this literary warfare. Philoxenus of Mabbôgh, Severus of Antioch, John of Tella, Jacob of Serûgh, Jacob Baradaeus, are names familiar to every Church historian as vigorous defenders of Monophysitism and lights of that creed both in Greek and Syriac.

Until lately, the Syriac writings of this school were comparatively, not to say entirely, neglected. Philoxenus in particular, has been almost entirely studied in the accounts of his Greek opponents, although he was a voluminous writer of Syriac prose on the scriptures, liturgy, asceticism and dogma. Competent scholars agree that his writings are among the best specimens of the golden age of Syriac literature. Professor Guidi, in particular, praises the exquisite purity of his diction, as well as the eloquence and strength of his style. Assemani long ago called him a most elegant writer of Syriac, though a "most corrupt man" and a "pernicious heretic." Among his own he is from the beginning one of their four great doctors, known particularly as The Interpreter, and not inferior to Saint Ephrem himself. Only a very few of his writings have been published in the original. Before 1873, there were accessible to us only a Latin translation of two liturgical pieces and some brief extracts in the *Bibliotheca Orientalis* of Assemani.

Out of the large body of unpublished manuscripts of Philoxenus, Dr. Vaschalde has selected the three letters mentioned on the title page of his work. We leave to the competent public the decision on the philological merits of his work—so superior a Syriac scholar as Professor Guidi of Rome was highly pleased with Dr. Vaschalde's treatment of the Syriac text. He has also carefully collated the Syriac text of these three letters with the originals in the Vatican Library.

The introduction sets forth more fully than can be found elsewhere the details of the checkered career of Philoxenus, a Persian by birth, born between 425 and 450, and deceased in exile, probably murdered, in 523. Violent partisan, active Monophysite bishop, founder of a long-lived heresy, and versatile writer and preacher—he may be not inappropriately termed the Saint Jerome of the Monophysites. In these three letters are found many interesting considerations on the Incarnation and the Trinity, apart from his heterodox belief concerning the two natures in Christ—a belief to which he furnished the philosophical and theological basis on which it sought to justify itself. These writings furnish several useful evidences and confirmations of the antiquity and universality of certain Catholic doctrines and practices. Thus, pages 76–78 offer pleasing proof of the belief of the Syriac Church in the real presence of Christ in the Blessed Sacrament. Elsewhere (p. 32) the consecration of the bishop of the Alexandrian Acephali shows a ritual identical with the local Roman ritual described by Mgr. Duchesne in his "*Origines du culte chrétien*" (Paris, 3d ed., 1903). His teaching concerning the Blessed Virgin as Mother of God is perfectly orthodox (p. 43) and very probably (p. 70) his writings furnish confirmation of the common Syriac belief in the Immaculate Conception. His teaching on original sin is in keeping with the doctrine of the Church (p. 69)—only in the doctrine of one nature in Christ, and the manner of the union of the humanity with the God-head does his divergence from orthodoxy become clear. With Eutyches he maintained only "one nature incarnate," but he differed from the latter in his explanation of the union—the strict Eutychians teaching a commingling of the natures, while Philoxenus taught the contrary and held that the two natures formed after the Incarnation a composite nature, somewhat after the manner of the union of body and soul in man. He could, therefore, maintain against the compulsory docetism of the Eutychians that the body of Christ was real. It is interesting also to note (p. 76) that the teaching of Philoxenus on the procession of the Holy Ghost from the Father and the Son is in perfect harmony with the

current belief of the Syriac Church manifested in a canon of the Synod of Seleucia (410), which is also one of the oldest documents of Syriac literature, a doctrine also held by Jacob of Serūgh and other famous Monophysite teachers.

The theologian and historian will regret that an index of the subjects treated in the introduction and translation is wanting. The theological glossary and the index of bible quotations and Greek words can not replace the "index rerum." St. Gregory of Nazianzen (p. 7) should be of Nazianzus or Nazianzos.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

J. J. Rousseau et Le Rousseauisme. Par Jean-Félix Nourrisson. Paris: Fontemoing, 1903. 8°, pp. xiv + 507.

M. Paul Nourrisson, son of the illustrious Catholic philosopher of the Institut and the Collège de France, has collected in the volume before us the lectures on Rousseau delivered by his father in the last period of his life. We have already called attention in the *BULLETIN* (II, pp. 392-397) to the method and spirit that Nourrisson brings to the study of master-characters in history. His Saint Augustine and his Voltaire will long remain as chefs d'œuvres of a manner that unites searching analysis of life and writings with a synthesis broad, equitable, and complete. In these pages we find Rousseau as he lived—a restless wanderer, vain, immoral, self-opinionated. His disorderly youth, his meanness and ingratitude, his outer subserviency and inward rebellion, are painted in his own language, no less vividly than his splendid gifts of style, his intense emotionalism, his sensitive impressionable fancy, his absolute prophetic attitude. Yet this bundle of contradictions stands like a Moses at the end of the eighteenth century, not to point out a promised land in the future, but to call society back to the paradise that men had destroyed through love of civilization. The French Revolution was the result of the little rift that the music-master of Chambéry opened in the public opinion of France, and more than one other far-reaching innovation owes its viability to the burning eloquence of this Mirabeau of French prose, this cosmopolitan vagabond of genius who wrote in the *Emile*, the *Contrat Social*, the *Profession de Foi du Vicaire Savoyard*, the *Nouvelle Héloïse* and his "Confessions" the great conquering evangel of modern naturalism. Into it he infused as none before or after him a proselytizing aggressive spirit—above all, he broke in rudely and disastrously on the time-honored influences of Christianity on the education of Europe. How ill qualified he was to take up the rôle of an apostle of the new education may be seen from the twenty chapters

through which M. Nourrisson follows his career from his birth in Geneva to his death in the solitude of Ermenonville.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

History of the Roman People. By Charles Seignobos, translation edited by William Fairley, Ph.D. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 528.

This elementary history of the Roman people has certain advantages. The style is graphic and pleasing, and the information is quite up to the latest standards. Brief tables of the "sources" and of the best works in English are given at the end of the chapter, also (Appendix F) a list of such English translations of the original sources as have been printed. The maps are admirably done, and of the numerous illustrations most are satisfactory. It is an advantage that the story of the Roman Empire should be carried on to the death of Charlemagne, as the youthful student thus acquires some sense of its power and charm. It might have been well to indicate the fact that, theoretically, the Roman Empire ceased only with the Fall of Constantinople (1453). In treating of the Christian religion and Rome, M. Seignobos is habitually correct and sympathetic—the editor attempts in a foot-note to offset the weight of his statements concerning St. Peter at Rome and the early preëminence of that see—a fact openly acknowledged by Harnack in the famous "excursus" of the first volume of his *History of Dogma*, likewise in his late essay on certain lost letters of the Roman clergy to Saint Cyprian. Elsewhere, M. Seignobos himself does not give (p. 469) a sufficient account of the development of the papal authority. It is not correct to attribute loosely to the Church the "sophistication with Greek philosophy" that the Gnostic heresies were responsible for. That churchmen in a Græco-Roman world spoke the philosophical language of their time is no proof that they diluted Christian teaching with Greek speculation. We miss in the "literature" on Christianity any reference to De Rossi's great labors made known in English by Northcote and Brownlow, also by Lowrie—indeed all Catholic literature seems neglected. The word "monkish" on page 466, is out of place, especially as the translator is not consistent, using elsewhere the proper term "monastic." The judgment on the religion of Charlemagne (p. 479) is simply false. With these reserves, the work may be commended to teachers as an excellent personal help in the school-room.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Mediæval Europe from 395 to 1270. By Charles Bémont and G. Monod, translated by Mary Sloan, with notes and revisions by George Burton Adams. New York: Henry Holt and Co., 1902. 8°, pp. 556.

The names of MM. Bémont and Monod are well enough known in historical schools to compel a respectful reading of any work due to their collaboration. This manual of mediæval history is not unworthy of their great learning, critical sense and narrative skill. Even in a translation these qualities are manifest. For its peculiar purpose we know no school summary of mediæval history more intelligently planned. The text is rich and varied, the historical maps numerous, the sources and literature well chosen. Were it not that good English works on mediæval history are not numerous, we might complain of the paucity of English books recommended. There is room for improvement, especially in the citation of English Catholic literature—thus, the work of Lingard on “Anglo-Saxon Antiquities” and the “Essays” of Cardinal Moran on the Early Irish Church are writings of classical character that might well be mentioned.

We are more inclined to complain of the Gallican, even Erastian, tone of the manual. It is Launoi and Fleury all through. In spite of a courteous phraseology the papacy seems grasping, ambitious, selfish. Mediæval emperors like Otto I. and Henry I. reform the ecclesiastical conditions “for the benefit of the state”—a formula that the “sources” do not justify. The relations between Charlemagne and the papacy, and between the Ottos and the same, are treated from an unhistorical and partisan angle. The unhappy circumstances of the tenth-century papacy are relieved by no suitable narration of the circumstances through which the fine gold lost its color and the rich perfume its savor. It is not admitted by all critics that the famous “*dictatus papæ*” are from the hand of Gregory VII. Nor is it certain that Hadrian I quoted for Charlemagne (p. 182) the Donation of Constantine. There is no better exposé of that fateful quarter of a century than Mgr. Duchesne’s “*Premiers Tempts de l’Etat Pontifical*” (Paris, 1898). In his sane and critical pages (notably 79–91) all that the sources make known with certainty about the origin of the Donation is set down, nothing therefore of a knowledge or participation of Hadrian I. There is altogether too much passion among certain historians in dealing with this period, too much “reading into” the texts of their own fixed views, too much “*Nuancirung*” that would be given an ugly name were Catholic historians to indulge in it. The right of appeals was not first claimed or established by Nicholas I (p. 222) nor did he

thereby shatter the royal authority in the Carolingian world. Neither was the Frankish Church *forced* (p. 178) to acknowledge its dependency on the Roman See. This is all better and more honestly told in Godefroid Kurth's "Origines de la Civilisation Moderne," or in Lecoy de la Marche "La Gaule Mérovingienne," not to say in the original texts themselves. In the latter the reader will look in vain for the shadings of feeling and assertions of principle, for the antithesis and suspicion that modern historians too often detect where they never existed. The portrait of St. Leger of Autun (p. 98) is not that which the learned Benedictine Cardinal Pitra has drawn in his fine life of that personage. The popes never took part in ecumenical councils on the same degree (p. 120) as other bishops—in the very first years of the Church's political triumph we see Pope Julius rebuking such great Eastern bishops as those of Antioch for violating the *ecclesiastical law* that reserved to him the convocation of important councils.

After all, it is not the errors of detail that affect the use of such a book—it is rather the unsympathetic attitude that it assumes wherever the political rôle of the papacy is up for consideration. Then the latter seems always an evil and dangerous culprit, somehow an enemy of society, the state, humanity, while its opponents are vaguely declared to be the representatives of enlightenment and equity. It is only just to say that very often distinctive Catholic institutions of the Middle Ages are treated in this work with profound respect and a sure sense of their place and workings in the raw centuries that beheld the rise of mediæval European humanity out of its wretched beginnings.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

La Vie Universitaire Dans L'Ancienne Espagne. Par Gustave Reynier. Paris: Picard, 1902. 8°, pp. 220.

It is a charming portrait of student life and habits that M. Reynier sketches for us in this little volume. All the romance of mediæval Spain is in it, though it treats only of students and teachers, of "pupilos, camaristas and capigorriones," of the Goliardic corporation of the "Tana," of the "Oposiciones" and "grados," the feasts and the fasts of the thousands who once sought learning at Salamanca and Alcalà. The former is the Oxford of Spain, and right proudly did she once inscribe on stone and bronze and parchment the inspiring words: *Omnium scientiarum princeps Salmantica docet*. Alcalà is the creation of Ximenes, almost at the gates of Madrid, and while the work of Ximenes endured, his splendid school flourished. To write

the history of universities in any land is to write the history of all profounder study as well as to measure their influence on society in all its forms—hence the instructive chapters on the rise, flourishing, and decadence of the universities of Spain. It is not necessary to subscribe fully to every appreciation of M. Raynier in order to enjoy his delightful book—perhaps no pages are more fascinating than those in which he describes the “Tana” or freemasonry of university vagabondage, and the “universitates silvestres,” those lonely and decadent little schools that Spanish generosity and individualism created in certain backwater-stretches of peninsular life.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Story of the Mormons from the Date of their Origin to the year 1901. By William Alexander Linn. New York: Macmillan, 1902. 8°, pp. 637.

No more fascinating book of American history has come before us in some years. The purpose of the writer is to present the actual facts of the origin, growth and consolidation of the most peculiar phenomenon of American religious life in the nineteenth century. Writings of the original Mormons, their periodical publications and correspondence, their autobiographies, histories of Utah and of Salt Lake City, by friend and foe, the national civil records,—above all, the Berrian collection of books, early newspapers and pamphlets on Mormonism owned by the New York Public Library, are the main sources of the narrative, and they permit a very accurate study of its external public life.

The student of Church History is arrested at every step by strangely familiar suggestions of primitive Christian life that are at once disfigured in the grotesque institutions of a Joseph Smith and a Brigham Young. Similarly all the outlines of a Jewish theocracy shine through the constitution of the Latter-Day Saints. That they have been able to reach the figure of 300,000 and control politically one of the great new states of the Union, not to say several, is another consideration of momentous import. The book of Mr. Linn deserves thoughtful reading. His plain unimpassioned narrative is a more powerful arraignment of Mormonism than any flaming denunciation of its evils could possibly be.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Papal Monarchy. By William Barry, D.D. New York: Putnam's, 1903. (*Story of the Nations.*) Pp. xxii + 435.

It is highly creditable to the publishers that they should have had the courage and good taste to select a Catholic for the historian of a subject which concerns Catholics so vitally. It is equally creditable to the historian that he has written with such fearlessness of the political errors and sins of the Papacy. Moreover, the work is above criticism, as a specimen of modern book-making. The style is easy, often brilliant. The portraiture of character is frequently vivid.

This said, we decline to subscribe unconditionally to the almost unanimous praise bestowed upon the book by reviewers, because, all in all, it strikes us as fundamentally weak by reason of its one-sidedness. Whether this be due to the author's embarrassment at being a Catholic or to lack of power of perspective we cannot say, but at all events he has given a picture of the mediæval papacy which can hardly cause either its friends or its enemies to increase their respect for it. This is apparent not so much in any error of fact, as in a certain tone, spirit, style which remind one continually of Gibbon. Verily it reads much like Gibbon whom, we venture to suspect, the author has followed rather closely despite the very good bibliography noted in the preface. Perhaps this is a harsh judgment, but it is at least curious to note the remark on p. 309. "I happen to be writing this page of history in the garden at Lausanne where Gibbon added the last stroke to his immense and as yet unrivalled panorama of the Roman Empire in decline." Now, ordinarily Father Barry's post-office address, even when engaged in his literary labors, would excite in us only a very languid interest, but it becomes of some importance in the present case when we read further down his endorsement of Gibbon as a "not unkindly" critic. Well! tastes differ. We have read Gibbon from cover to cover, and separate chapters frequently, and the impression created was that his work is by all odds the most insidious and dishonest arraignment of the Papacy yet written, and that is saying a good deal. If an author then has this opinion of Gibbon it is not unjust to class him as a disciple.

The effect of his book is as likely to be injurious as otherwise. The average non-Catholic will not have his prejudices against the Papacy lessened; and he will fail to see the truth of the closing eulogium to the effect that the benefits of the Papal monarchy "out-number by far its abuses." Such a conclusion does not logically follow from the facts as presented. At best it might be taken as a funeral oration over the corpse of a poor relative. What is worse, this prejudice will be extended to the spiritual side of the Papacy because

the author does not clearly separate the political from the spiritual aspects. In fact, we fail to see exactly what he means by "Papal Monarchy." On the other hand, the ultramontane will not be converted from his political allegiance to the dead past, and thus will be defeated one of the objects which we suspect Father Barry had mainly in view. On the whole, then, despite the many excellencies of the book—its brilliancy in style and arrangement, its fearless candor—we must regret that the author let slip a splendid opportunity to write a first class essay. Whatever his work be, it is not an adequate presentation of the subject; it marks another failure among the many that have gone before it. The fundamental defect of all is a lack of perspective, and the presence of too much subjectivity.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

The Lords Baltimore and the Maryland Palatinate. Six lectures on Maryland Colonial History delivered before the Johns Hopkins University in the year 1902, by Clayton Coleman Hall, LL.B., A.M. Baltimore: John Murphy Company, 1903. Pp. xvii + 216.

It is worthy of note that some of the best monographs on Maryland colonial history have come from the pens of lawyers. Perhaps this is due to their legal training which gives them both the ability to handle evidence and the proper temper in which to discuss controversy. Both these qualities are strikingly evident in the present work from the pen of a distinguished member of the Baltimore bar. In his treatment of "Religious Toleration in Maryland" his method has been strictly objective, stating facts as he thought he found them and expressing no hypotheses. His views on this question are the same as those now generally accepted by Maryland's leading historians, though there is a freshness in the presentation of them which lends them a peculiar interest. His general view is that religious toleration in Maryland was "due to one man, the broad-minded proprietary, and not to any religious body." Whilst accepting this view in general we venture to be somewhat sceptical anent the opinion expressed on same page (page 83). "It is not necessary to assign the credit of this act" (of Toleration) "to the Roman Catholic Church or to any other religious body or to the Protestant majority in the Maryland Assembly." Now we fully agree that this Act was not due to either Catholicity or Protestantism, but, as said before, to the liberality of one man who was reflecting in himself the nascent tendency of his time towards religious freedom or, what is the same, religious compromise. But that sentence is awkward. The author will surely

pardon a little sensitiveness on the part of a Catholic who is quite anxious to give the credit of this Act to Catholicity merely in order to silence the current Protestant suspicion of the same as a foe of religious liberty. In which sense the question of authority does assume considerable importance, however little logical connection it may have with the fact in the eyes of the more intelligent few. Still less can we imagine the author asserting that the Maryland Assembly actually at the time had a "Protestant Majority," as he surely would not have thus gone against the accepted opinion to the contrary without giving proof. At best the sentence is squinting, and we confess our inability to make out just what it means.

However, this only by the way. As a whole the book is an able temperate and interesting contribution to the history of Maryland. The fact of its considering the subject chiefly from a biographical point of view lends it a novelty of its own. It is to be hoped that Mr. Hall will continue on in the work so well begun, and that all who come after him will write with the same objectivity.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

An Introduction to the History of Western Europe. By James Harvey Robinson, Professor of History in Columbia University. Boston: Ginn and Company, 1903. 8°, pp. xi + 714.

All in all, Professor Robinson has written an excellent manual. Obligated by the short space at his disposal to notice only the salient facts of history, he has used good judgment in his selection. From a typographical point of view, it is above criticism—the binding attractive, printing clear, profusely illustrated with maps and pictures of prominent places and personages, and well indexed. The style is easy and natural.

Great praise is also due the treatment of the matter. Above all, is the author to be congratulated upon the prevailing tone of impartiality when treating delicate periods of history such as the Reformation, French Revolution, and the like. Certainly, the book shows evidence that he has tried to be fair and tried with marked success. Although, of course, he writes from the standpoint of a non-Catholic he has succeeded generally in stating Catholic doctrines and practice correctly. It is therefore, with the most profound respect for the author's learning and spirit that we venture to point out some of the few blemishes in his book.

Not all Americans share his admiration for the works of Henry C. Lea (p. iv); in fact, that abler writer has vitiated his work with so

much bigotry and not a little ignorance that his labors are doomed to oblivion the very moment that an equally voluminous and more fair history is written. And, by the way, if Professor Robinson has time, he would do well to look up Catholic authorities for insertion in his contemplated "Readings in European History." A short reference to any general histories like those of Alzog or Hergenröther will supply them all.

Again, a confession of mortal sins is not (p. 211) a necessary condition of salvation in all cases. It is necessary only when possible. Then, too, "tradition, that is the practices and teachings of the Church" is not bound up with "inspiration" (p. 370); nor does it concern all "practices," whatever is meant by them. Also, it is hard to see what the author means by saying that the Franciscans came "under the spiritual authority of the Roman Church" because they received the "tonsure (224). Still more ambiguous is the statement that the saints "came to be invoked" in somewhat the same way as the ancient pagan gods (p. 19); and that the "protection of the papal possessions" was "made one with the observance of Christian faith" (p. 45). As to the divine origin of the Papacy, the author is, as might be supposed, not at all sympathetic (see pp. 21, 50, 64, 159, 163). But he is not abusive. Of Part I, the best and fairest chapter is that on the "Monks." That on the Crusades is neither sympathetic nor altogether fair, strange to say, whilst that on "Heresy and the Friars" shows the malign influence of Mr. H. C. Lea.

The treatment of both the Renaissance and the Reformation is in most respects admirable, although the author, perhaps unconsciously, does not give a fair comparative view of religious persecutions: he dwells upon those suffered by Protestants and refers rather casually to those inflicted by them upon Catholics. The chapters on the French Revolution are masterly and by far the best we know of in any similar manual. On the whole, the book is unusually able fair and interesting.

LUCIAN JOHNSTON.

Saint Victrice, Evêque de Rouen (IV-V century). Par E. Vacandard. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903. 8°, pp. 186.

Sainte Hildegarde (1098-1179). Par Paul Franche. Ibid., 1903. 8°, pp. 209.

1. This pen-picture of Saint Victricius of Rouen is quite a *nouveauté*. Students of history will be grateful to the Abbé Vacandard for the local color and the scientific dress of his little book. From the standpoint of the history of ecclesiastical institu-

tions and canon law, Saint Victricius is a figure of interest. His life illustrates the relations of the Church and the army in the Theodosian times, the development of the translation and veneration of the relics of martyrs, the revival of the missionary or apostolic temperament, the growth of monasticism, the history of Latin style, the universal character of papal authority and other details of ecclesiastical life previous to the overthrow of the civil prestige of the Eternal City. We recommend the perusal of this book to all lovers of early Church history—it is enough to say that it comes from the pen of the historian of Saint Bernard and Saint Ouen.

2. Such modern German historians of Sainte Hildegarde as Ludwig Clarus and Dr. Schmelzeis have not exhausted the perennial charm of the character and writings of the great mediæval prophetess. Görres "Mysticism," the Romantic movement in early nineteenth-century Germany, coupled with the completion of Cologne Cathedral and the mystical phenomena of Catharine Emmerich and others, did much to revive the cultus of the Sibyl of the Rhineland. Then Cardinal Pitra's enlarged reëdition of her curious "Opera Omnia" gave a new impetus to the study of her times and her writings. In a way she recalls St. Catharine of Siena and St. Bridget of Sweden. An overpowering love drives her out upon the highways of the world as a voice of the Holy Spirit, to preach to the highest authorities a renewal of justice, charity, and faith. Her slight figure dominates the scene whereon moved a Conrad III and a Frederick Barbarossa, an Eugenius III, an Adrian IV, an Alexander III. Her extensive correspondence with the summities of civil and religious life, her position on the central Rhine as counsellor of all German society, her splendidly picturesque and Dantesque revelations, the possession and cultivation from infancy of an "inner light" or perlucid state in which the highest moral consciousness of her time reached its most acute stage, raise this extraordinary woman to a place among the permanent historico-religious influences of mediæval Catholicism, at a time when the Empire and the Church, the Orient and the Occident, feudalism, democracy and monarchy, were engaged in that multitudinous conflict whose consequences, foreseen and foretold by the prophetess, were the Renaissance and the Reformation.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Le Théâtre Français Au Moyen Age. Par Johan Mortensen, traduit du suédois par Emmanuel Philipot. Paris: Picard, 1903. 8°, pp. 254.

To what an extent is the French theatre of Corneille and Racine

the direct successor of the religious dramatic activity of the Middle Ages? Dr. Mortensen answers this question in a series of charming conferences delivered at Gothembourg (Sweden) in 1899, and now rendered into elegant French. He traces the growth of the grave and ancient liturgical drama from the musically read "Lectiones" and the "antiphonal" chant of the mass, then that of the biblical drama from the representation of scenes and personages, chiefly typical of the Old Testament. In time the beloved lives of the saints furnish new material, especially elements of the marvelous and supernatural. Thus we have the "Mysteries" and the "Miracles" that abound from the early part of the twelfth century. Originally written in Latin, the vernacular French is substituted about the same time. Eventually local and comic features or "traits de mœurs," as well as subjects of romance and chivalry, get themselves adopted in these great popular representations which enthused the mediæval multitudes in a way that we can no longer easily comprehend. Vocal and instrumental music, absolute religious faith, native and popular artistic sense, mediæval love for democratic enjoyment, are auxiliary elements in the genesis of these original Christian manifestations of the dramatic temperament. In time this religious drama was organized, chiefly at Paris. As the Middle Ages wear away, the satirical, the personal, the didactic, gradually destroy or imperil the primitive theological character and purpose of all such plays. At Paris the Basoche, the Enfants sans souci, and the Confrérie de la Passion are the intermediaries of the dramatic novelties gradually introduced through the new forms of *moralités*, *farces*, *soties*, *histoires* and the like. It seems curious enough that it was the reaction against the Reformation that brought about in France the suppression of the last phases of the old mediæval religious drama. But long ere this, it had been the common training-ground of the peculiar French genius for light comedy and delicate satire. There is much to glean in the work of Dr. Mortensen, even after the exhaustive treatises of the modern historians of French literature, like Aubertin and Petit de Julleville and specialists like Marius Sepet.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Creeds. An historical and doctrinal exposition of the Apostles', Nicene, and Athanasian Creeds. By Rev. Alfred G. Mortimer, D.D. New York: Longmans, 1902. 8°, p. 316.

Dr. Mortimer presents in this work a judicious selection of the most approved conclusions concerning the oldest formulas of Christian

faith. Caspari and Kattenbusch, Harnack and Zahn, Heurtley and Swainson, McGiffert and Swete, Ommaney and Burns, have left unstudied almost no detail or phase of investigation that could throw light on the process by which the primitive Christians came to look on these great "Creeds" as the mirrors or equivalent of absolute orthodoxy. In this work the reader may acquaint himself, in a summary way, with the chief details of the literary history of the creeds as drawn from the exhaustive works already mentioned. As a rule, the theological commentary of Dr. Mortimer adheres to the old line of Catholic exposition. In an appendix he reprints the oldest historical references to the Apostles' Creed. As a brief exposé of the history of the latter we prefer the little volume of Dr. Swete (*The Apostles' Creed*, London, 1894) and the erudite pages of our own Dr. Bardenhewer (*Geschichte der altkirchlichen Literatur*, Freiburg, 1902, Vol. I). The student of historical theology will always read with profit the article of the Abbé Vacandard on the history of the Apostles' Creed in the "*Revue des Questions Historiques*" (Vol. 66, pp. 329-377), similarly the learned disquisitions of the "*Theologische Quartalschrift*" of Tuebingen.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Un Siècle De L'Eglise De France. Par Mgr. Baunard. 3d ed. Paris: Poussielgue, 1902. 8°, pp. 538.

The former Rector of the Catholic University of Lille was an indefatigable writer in the service of Catholic truth and ideas. His "Victims of Doubt" and "Victories of Faith" are well known, likewise his lives of Saint Ambrose, of Cardinals Pie and Lavigerie, of Madame Barat, Madame Duchesne, and General De Sonis. His "*Dieu dans l'Ecole*" is a favorite work of Christian pedagogy for teachers and students in Catholic colleges. Experience office and talent made him fit to draw an eloquent outline of the ecclesiastical history of France in the nineteenth century. The twenty-two chapters of the work deal with Pius VII and Napoleon, Gallicanism, the Catholic Party and Liberty, Learning and Eloquence, Pius IX and France, Christian Teaching, Priests and Religion, the Bishops and Roman Unity, Anti-Christianity and its results, the Kingdom of Jesus Christ, Mary Immaculate, Worship and Christian Art, Charity, Leo XIII, Anti-clericalism, the Political and Social Crisis, Theology and Philosophy, Pulpit and Press, Mission, Martyrdom, Saints and Holiness, the Two Cities. Under these rubrics Mgr. Baunard disposes a multitude of interesting phenomena of the life of French Catholicism since the Revolution. France has been so long

in the foremost rank of Catholicism that a century of her church history is equivalent to that of the entire Church as far as general experience, institutions, policy, action and suffering go.

The political institutions of the New World differ so much in their history spirit and operation from those of the Old World, most deeply rooted in France, that much of the political experience of Catholicism in that land is intelligible to us only by a serious effort of reflexion. Yet these political issues appear, from one point of view, to dominate and affect seriously the life of the Church in France. It is only when we are compelled to study it in miniature, as it were, that the far-reaching consequences of tradition and habit manifest themselves. Hence, all who would go to the root of the present situation in France would do well to peruse this book, not to adopt all the views of its author, but to rise with him to a view d'ensemble. He is inexact when he refers to the losses of American Catholicism—neither his figures nor his explanation will bear investigation. His judgments on the episcopate of France are marked by a certain severity; they do not, perhaps, allow for the great practical difficulties of the episcopal office in that land. One cannot say that Mgr. Baunard has refused to touch on the weakness of French ecclesiastical life and government; he is, however, quite conservative and stationary in his attitude toward all the later developments in the clergy of France—in more senses than one a priest “de la vieille roche.”

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Mémoires De Langeron, General d'infanterie dans l'armée russe, Campagnes de 1812–1814 publiées d'après le manuscrit original. Par L. G. E. Paris: Picard (Société d'Histoire Contemporaine), 1902. 8°, pp. cxx + 524.

Mémoire De Ma Détention Au Temple 1797–1799. Par P. Fr. de Rémusat, Introduction notes et commentaire, par Victor Pierre. Paris: *ibid.*, 1903. 8°, pp. xlii + 191.

1. The French nobleman and émigré, Langeron, relates in this second volume of his mémoires the events of Napoleon's campaigns of 1812 to 1814, as seen from the Russian standpoint. The details of the retreat from Moscow and the passage of the Beresina are particularly interesting, likewise the portrait of Blücher. A lengthy preface brings to the study of these campaigns such information as only a military scholar can appreciate.

2. In the brief account of his two years imprisonment in the Temple during the Terror, M. de Rémusat, a respectable and innocent merchant of Marseilles, causes us to assist day by day at the reckless injustice and violence practiced in those trying years upon a multitude of harmless persons, caught up daily in the drag nets of the police, and left to languish in filth and starvation, when not borne away to instant execution. On the list of prisoners of the Temple as made out by M. de Rémusat we come across the names of Irishmen from Cork, Englishmen from London, and Americans from New York Boston and Philadelphia.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

La Bienheureuse Mère Marie De L'Incarnation (Madame Acarie)
1566-1618. Par Emmanuel de Broglie. Paris: Lecoffre, 1903.
8°, pp. 210.

Intimate knowledge of the social and political life of France in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries is almost an heirloom in the De Broglie family. This little volume narrates the events which led to the foundation at Paris in 1602 of the first Carmelite monastery in France. Apropos of the share which fell to the lot of Madame Acarie, the distinguished author of "Fénelon à Cambrai" and of the literary existence of Mabillon, has drawn for us an exquisite portrait of the religious spirit and activity of France in the latter half of the sixteenth century. This rich "veuve parisienne," mother of six children, half ruined by her husband's political misfortunes through the overthrow of the Ligue and the triumph of Henri IV, finds time nevertheless, to devote herself to works of piety and charity, so well that all Paris soon recognizes in her a soul of exquisite distinction. Her salon is the rendezvous of a genuine spiritual Catholicism, and from it goes forth the generous idea of endowing France with establishments after the heart and the rule of Saint Theresa. M. de Broglie has sketched with a sure sense of proportion the rôle of Madame Acarie in this enterprise, the future record of which is equivalent to the moral history of the century of Bossuet and Fénelon—so closely interwoven is the Paris Carmel with the history of the governing classes of seventeenth-century France. His heroine died in the odor of sanctity; the cause of her canonization has been introduced at Rome since 1627. There is every reason to believe that France still produces specimens of that "âme française" which M. Brunetière declares profoundly and socially Catholic.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Histoire Du Moyen Age, depuis la chute de l'Empire Romain jusqu'à la fin de l'époque franque (476-950). Par Ch. Moeller, professeur à l'Université de Louvain. Paris: Fontemoing, 1898-1902. 8°, pp. xv + 397.

Professor Charles Moeller of Louvain is favorably known for his edition of the useful work of his father, Jean Moeller, entitled "Traite des études historiques" (Paris, 1887-1892). The volume before us presents the general political history of the first period of the Middle Ages. The special history, or that of mediæval institutions, is touched on but lightly, being reserved for another work. In each chapter only the substantial and necessary facts are narrated—there is but little philosophic consideration. The original authorities are always indicated in large type, also the classical works that deal with the subject. This book has many advantages as a manual for teaching and for self-instruction, and we hope that it will be much used in our Catholic colleges, at least by instructors. It needs an alphabetical index—without such a help manuals of history are stripped of half their value to the busy teacher and student.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Die Peschitta Zum Buche Der Weisheit, eine kritisch-geschichtliche Studie. By Joseph Holtzmann. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1903. Pp. xii + 152. \$1.25 net.

The author of this important contribution to the textual criticism of the Book of Wisdom examines (1) the condition of the *textus receptus* as we have it now; (2) the original from which it was translated; (3) the method followed by the translator; (4) the history of the translation.

His conclusions are briefly as follows: The various recensions of the Peschittian Book of Wisdom do not differ essentially. Indeed, they agree so well, even in their defects, that they all appear to come from one official text, much defaced by errors and interpolations. That original text was certainly in Greek. Once published, the Syriac translation was several times collated and brought into more perfect harmony with the same Greek original. At the same time it remained free from Syro-hexaplaric influence. Later, it was again corrected or revised, from mere internal evidence however, quite independently of the Greek original. Indeed, the reviser was evidently ignorant of the Greek language. This Greek original differs from any known text in the same idiom, while it betrays close kinship with

the "Vetus Latina" and must have come from the same source. More than that, the author of the "Vetus Latina" seems to have consulted the Peschitta.

It is hardly necessary to emphasize the usefulness of Dr. Holtzmann's study. The Peschitta, like most of the other important versions, counts almost as many authors as there are books in the Bible. Each Book therefore has to be studied separately. This has been done for most of the Protocanonical Books, while so far only two of the Deutero-Canonical Books have enjoyed such a privilege (Baruch and the First Book of Maccabees). We regret that the author had to use Hebrew type for the Syriac quotations. Otherwise his work is thorough and cannot be commended too highly.

HENRY HYVERNAT.

A Reply to Professor Bourne's "The Whitman Legend." By Myron Eells, D.D. Walla Walla, Wash., 1902. 12°, pp. 123.

Long before missionaries of any denomination had crossed the Rocky Mountains north of the Mexican possessions, French Canadians, and Iroquois and Nipissing, domiciliated Indians of Canada, employees of the British fur companies, had imparted the elementary principles of Christianity to the tribes in the old Oregon Territory. Rev. Jason Lee founded the first mission, that of the Methodists, among the Canadians and Calapooya Indians in the Willamette Valley in 1834; Rev. Herbert Beaver and wife, who came from England by sea, founded an Anglican mission at Fort Vancouver in 1836, and Marcus Whitman, M.D., and Rev. H. H. Spalding and their wives, founded the Presbyterian missions at Waiilatpu and Lapwai, on the Upper Columbia, later in the same year. Very Rev. Francis Norbertus Blanchet founded the first Catholic missions at Fort Vancouver and Cowlitz Prairie in 1838; and Rev. Fr. P. J. De Smet, S.J., founded the Flathead mission of the Rocky Mountains in 1841.

From these missions sprang others, until November 29, 1847—two days after the establishment of the Umatilla mission by Rt. Rev. Maglorius Blanchet, Bishop of Walla Walla, and Very Rev. J. B. A. Brouillet, his vicar-general—when Dr. Whitman, catechist and teacher at the Waiilatpu mission, was inhumanly murdered by his Cayuse Indians, together with several members of his household. This event brought on Indian wars and caused the abandonment for some years of all the Upper Columbia missions.

After the rescue of Rev. Mr. Spalding from his Lapwai mission, among the Nez Percés, his mind, always unstable, gave way, and

in his degeneracy he basely charged the Catholic missionaries with inciting the Protestant Indians to the breaking up of their missions. This story was eagerly taken up by ultra-Protestant writers and served a purpose during the Know-Nothing agitation on the Pacific Coast in the middle of the last century. Feeling himself and his missionary companions to be neglected by his missionary association, Mr. Spalding in 1865, then more of an illusionist than ever, advanced the preposterous proposition that the missionaries, and Dr. Whitman in particular, had saved Oregon to the United States from the machinations of the Hudson's Bay Company and the Catholic missionaries, by his undertaking a journey to Washington in the winter of 1842, to advise the Tyler administration against trading off Oregon for a cod-fishery privilege off the coast of Maine, and to bring immigrants to settle and occupy the Oregon country. This is the basis of the "Whitman-Saved-Oregon" claim, designed to illustrate the ultimate success of the Presbyterian missions of the Upper Columbia, which as a matter of fact, were unsuccessful, from various causes, chief among which were dissensions between the missionaries themselves, and the eventual substitution of grasping commercialism to the missionary principle.

In 1871, Rev. Mr. Spalding, still deeming himself neglected, appealed to the civil authorities for employment, under the Grant "Peace Policy," through the means of his "Early Labors of the Missionaries of the American Board of Commissioners for Foreign Missions in Oregon, commencing in 1836," which he succeeded in having published as Senate Ex. Doc. No. 37. This is one of the most extraordinary publications that ever issued from the presses of any Government. It is a scandalous fabrication of most glaring untruths; yet it is the unavowed source of the writings of the propagators of the "Whitman-Saved-Oregon" claim, the principal of whom are the Rev. Messrs. Barrows, Eells (father and son), Craighead, and Mowry.

To their honor and credit Principal Marshall of Chicago and Professor Bourne of Yale University—the first by the collation of the entire bibliography and historical sources on the subject, the results of which he has given in newspaper articles, to be followed by a formal history, and the latter by a most scholarly essay based on Mr. Marshall's data as well as on his own intelligent original researches, have placed the question on a new basis, contradictory of the thesis expressed by "The Whitman Legend."

The pamphlet before us is an attempt to turn away the stream which is devastating the fabric of "The Oregon Myth." Like the mighty Columbia, sweeping down to the ocean, the fabrications of

man are unavailing to stem its flood. As a composition the pamphlet is scarcely above mediocrity, and as an argument it is exceedingly weak, the author apparently lacking literary training and historical acumen to cope with such an historical athlete as Professor Bourne. The principal source of his weakness, however, lies in the fact that, having in the past written too much and too confidently on the Oregon question, he is not now susceptible of being impressed by the truth; nor would he be free to admit the fact if he were convinced of the weakness of the cause he has so zealously espoused, since filial duty would make it unseemly.

EDMOND MALLET.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

Oxford and Cambridge Conferences. Second Series: 1900-1901.

By Joseph Rickaby, S.J. St. Louis: B. Herder, 1902. Pp. 246.

There are very few educated Catholics, clerical or lay, for whom the reading of Father Rickaby's Conferences would not be an entertaining occupation. His talks possess so much of what is called *actualité*, that if, when first delivered, they came forth with any thing like the facility that appears on the printed page, they must have won the strictest kind of attention from his audience.

Father Rickaby is already well known to the world, both as a philosophical writer and as the author of a previous volume of conferences. The present book contains no surprises, but is what might be reasonably anticipated from the writer; that is, a work solid and instructive in matter, pointed and original in expression. Some very difficult questions are touched upon, but only for popular, not for scholarly treatment, and the impression left is a general sense of a clearing-up and illuminating process. In presenting the Catholic doctrines concerning Holy Scripture in the light of the "Providentissimus Deus," our author gives a very helpful and very attractive treatment of matters that could easily have been made to appear obscure and incomprehensible. One is tempted to quote in support of this verdict, but justice would demand too long a quotation. Let the reader consult the conference "Inspiration and Historical Accuracy of the Holy Scripture" as a sample of the author's style and as a model of a popular method of imparting instruction. As there is no attempt at profundity of research in these pages, so neither is there any attempt at sonorous phrasing; the tone is conversational in its freedom. This, however, does not prevent the book from being quite suitable for a library of apologetical literature; for it teaches much

about many things, clearly, pleasantly, and in brief compass. Like every properly prepared volume, this one has an index.

JOSEPH MCSORLEY.

ST. THOMAS COLLEGE.

Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis. Auctore Thoma Joseph Bouquillon, S.T.D., et in Universitate Catholica Americana Theologiæ Moralis Professore. Editio tertia recognita et adaucta. Brugis: Beyært, 1903. Pp. 743.

This third edition of the Fundamental Theology was issuing from the press when the illustrious author died. Failing health had somewhat dulled his keenness of mind, while he was engaged in the work of revision, but he had completed his task when he was called to his reward.

The new edition is somewhat enlarged, but there are no essential changes. The introduction contains a more detailed discussion of fundamental notions, and the historical part has been perfected. It includes the most recent literature bearing on the relations of Moral Theology. The purpose of this notice, therefore, need not be other than to call attention to this splendid monument of learning and to recommend it without qualification to all clergymen and others who desire to possess a clear and comprehensive presentation of the principles of Moral Theology.

When the second edition appeared it won for its author the unstinted praise of two continents. He was declared *Summus Magister*, for he had shown a mastery of his science that was unexcelled among his contemporaries. He had given to it the elasticity, progressiveness and system which it had greatly needed. From the view-point of "literature" alone, the Fundamental is a remarkable book. The author's knowledge of the literary sources of his science was extraordinary. He skilfully drew out what was permanent and best in all preceding literature of every question which he treated; he added to that fund by his own keen insight and wide knowledge of the reasons and relations of truths, and he presented the results in his text with great clearness. Yet, his erudition never made him a pedant, nor did his skill in thinking ever convert him into a skeptic.

The place that the volume occupies in the literature of Moral Theology cannot be better described than by drawing from the lamented author's study on "Moral Theology at the End of the Nineteenth Century," in BULLETIN for April, 1899. The thought in brief is as follows.

Moral Theology deals with practical revealed truth and its relations. A gradual disintegration has robbed the science of its dignity, and it has become a mere technical necessity for the priest. Through political and religious revolutions theology had lost contact with other sciences and was driven from the universities to seminaries and sacristies. Later, Moral Theology was separated from Dogmatic Theology; then the laws of Christian perfection were taken into Ascetical Theology; those of the religious life were taken up into Liturgy, those of public life into Law. Thus reduced to the narrowest limits, and confined largely to the consideration of private life, Moral Theology was converted into a set of conclusions and applications, while the principles on which these rested were neglected. Finally, in the teaching of the science, different aspects of moral questions were treated by different professors. The science had disintegrated, it had lost its dignity, its nature was misunderstood.

The author understood this historical process thoroughly, and he made it the purpose of his life to assist in restoring the science to its proper place. His *Fundamental Theology* is the supreme effort of his career. The concluding words of the study to which we refer express directly the scope of his work and the spirit of its accomplishment.

"A more intimate union with the theoretical truths of revelation is necessary, so that the laws of right living may be seen to spring from the very heart of dogma. Critical study and extended research into the development of the fundamental ideas and principles of moral life and their applications, not alone in Christian times, but in Old Testament times as well, and back to the beginning of humanity, must be made. The intelligent application of these principles to the problems of modern individual, social, religious and civil life is essential to the reestablishment which we seek, as is also a more constant contact with the other social sciences from which, rightly understood, only good can come. There is reason to hope that the coming century will see this done, for the impetus has already been given in the admirable encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII."

The *Fundamental* is a magnificent contribution to the literature of Moral Theology. When the science shall have been reconstructed, no one can doubt that Professor Bouquillon's name will stand high among the great ones in its history.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Social Unrest. By J. G. Brooks. New York: Macmillan, 1903. Pp. 394.

The author of this volume is one of the best known as well as most highly appreciated students of our social conditions. He has done much of his studying in and among the events that have characterized the recent industrial life of the nation. "Social Unrest" is a fascinating volume. The author tells us with great directness and force of the results of many years of painstaking observation.

The volume is full of real information about labor unions, labor leaders, socialism, employers, recent changes in socialistic thought in Europe, and it contains an accurate appreciation of some of the deeper tendencies in economic activity.

The author's personality appears on every page; the use of his own experience on which he largely draws, does not require the apology which he makes, but on the contrary enhances the value and the charm of the book.

This well-merited praise might be all that a reviewer would be required to write, did not the positive and direct way of the author tend somewhat to mislead readers. That trait of the volume may be referred to without diminishing in any way, we hope, the welcome which the book merits and is undoubtedly destined to receive.

The introductory chapter conveys the impression that books are either misleading or largely useless in the study of social questions. "It was several years before I learned that for one branch of economic study, the live questions like strikes, trade unions, the influence of machinery, very few books existed that had more than a slight value." The author undoubtedly implies that books rightly made—as his own—are useful, while books published by mere theorizers are of little use. There are, of course, useless books, but it would seem that there is some danger of misleading when one makes a statement so broad. The right use of books might save many men from becoming extreme reformers, and right training of writers and thinkers should enable us to learn how to use and how not to use books: how to examine and how not to examine life independently of books. "Social Unrest" is a creditable combination of the right use and right avoidance of books. The author has studied them well, and used them, in fact, throughout his work with good effect. Yet his main emphasis is on events, men and forces as they actually shape life.

Mr. Brooks calls attention to his discovery, "inexcusably late," to use his words, that "most men do not put their deepest opinions into print, or state them before the public." His aim was to find

out those deeper opinions and present them as supplementary evidence in his social study.

It is well known that men who deal with vital questions, with problems which deeply concern public welfare, do not and can not always put their deeper opinions into print. It is well that they do not. The legitimate stability of the social order, public or industrial position, natural fallibility of human judgment and the prospect that to-morrow's knowledge may change to-day's views, are all elements which tend to deter full frank, general expression of deeper opinion. Extreme reformers always express their most advanced thought; as a result we have no patience with them. Had Ruskin said only half of what he felt about life and its problems, he would undoubtedly have accomplished much more for the ideals that he loved so intensely. We must ask that men be entirely honest as far as they do express opinions; but it seems dangerous to encourage leaders to go farther in their public teaching than the institutions and temper of their time can safely allow. Naturally dishonest teaching is to be reprobated, but prudent reserve and legitimate caution must be exercised in our teaching when times are as troubled as they now are.

It is not impossible that the author's frankness itself leads one to misunderstand him when he makes the observations referred to. Leaving them aside, as secondary, one must give the author of "Social Unrest" credit for having written a most instructive book. In having included such a great variety of topics, he denied to himself the opportunity of far-reaching analysis and classification. Yet as a book full of instruction, revealing much sympathy with life and its problems, written at the cost of great personal effort and possibly the sacrifice of comfort, "Social Unrest" merits well of the public. It can be highly recommended to students of the Social Question.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Le Compagnonnage. Par E. Martin Saint-Léon. Paris: Colin. 1902. Pp. xxviii + 374.

This volume contains a study of the origin, development and present condition of that form of labor union known in French as *Le Compagnonnage*—corresponding to the stage in craft instruction which in the Middle Ages preceded mastership.

The work is one of many due to the revival of interest in mediæval labor. In a charming narrative and concrete style, the author tells us the fascinating story of a very important branch of mediæval organization; a combination of faith, religion, industry, mystery and

good-fellowship, which we scarcely find to-day in our civilization, not even in the remnants of the organization itself.

The author shows scholarly caution where his sources are doubtful, and a good historical sense in his manner of presentation. The reader may be interested in the main thought of the work which we briefly indicate. In so doing we invert the order followed by the author in his exposition.

The Middle Ages reveals organization everywhere; in France the *corporations* and in Germany the *guilds* were of course unions of laborers or artisans. The confraternities were religious organizations which united the laboring men as Christians and pledged them to benevolent work in the interest of one another; the itinerant wholesale merchants had their organizations, and later even the free masons appeared as a form of organized labor.

The Corporations in France included three divisions of artisans: *apprentis, valets, maîtres*. In earlier days the apprentice might become master directly, but in the fourteenth century the intermediate stage appears permanently. The term *compagnon* replaced *valet* and it remains in use to-day.

The Companions were therefore logically on the way to master-ship, but about the fourteenth century this latter distinction was earned with great difficulty. One was forced to remain companion for four or five years, or was forced to travel from village to village to complete one's education. The production of the masterpiece was difficult and costly, and the whim of the judges determined whether or not one succeeded. Many laborers were too poor, many too lazy, many too dull to advance beyond that condition. There they remained during life. They were thus a distinct class; distinct in intelligence, methods, social standing, and in the fact that they were forced to travel. Naturally a class sense arose, and that was followed by organization. Their purpose being self-protection and their interests being distinct from those of the corporations, they naturally drifted into secrecy; thus the association became a secret society, into which initiation was attended by deep mystery and sworn pledges of secrecy. The organization spread pretty generally over France, and some remnants of it remain to-day. Elaborate ceremony marked every function. Their members were baptized and named. They were at home wherever they went in making the *tour de France*. They found in every village a lodging place, whose proprietor was affiliated to the organization.

The records show that the association was based largely on a religious sentiment, that it exercised originally a strong moral influ-

ence over its members. The clergy appeared to have been sympathetic with it, though it was condemned by the Sorbonne in 1655 for secrecy, profanation of God's name, derision of religion, diabolical traditions, etc.

The origin of the association is obscure. Levasseur, in his history of the French laboring classes, doubts any records earlier than the fourteenth century. Though our author finds nothing certain before the fifteenth century, he is inclined to think that the association dates from the late twelfth century. In its best days it was divided into three great branches. Its power waned rapidly towards the eighteenth century, though there are some vigorous remnants of the association in France. The author exposes the present condition of the society with considerable detail.

The work is extremely interesting and valuable on account of the numerous sources to which reference is constantly made, and because of the concrete and lucid manner of exposition followed. The study is a companion to the author's larger work, *Histoire des Corporations de Métiers*, which appeared in 1897. His last work is on Trusts, the volume having just appeared in the *Bibliothèque d'Economie Sociale* of Paris.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

The Girlhood of Our Lady. By Marion J. Brunowe. New York: The Cathedral Library Association.

There is material for a score of delicate poems in Miss Brunowe's handsome little volume. She has connected in a series of short chapters many of the prettiest legends of the early life of Mary, and in the rendering from the ancient stories she has managed to keep the delicious savor of piety that permeates the original legends. Here and there the authoress has thrown in some topological description and an occasional bit of actual Oriental custom. They give a tinge of reality to the devout imaginings of the traditions. There is also an abundance of delightful pictures, some of them reproductions of the old masters, others of the modern German pietistic painters, all of them as soothing to the eye as the text is pleasing to the imagination.

JAMES C. GILLIS.

Hermeneutica Biblica Generalis secundum principia catholica. Scripsit Dr. Stephanus Székely, professor p.o. studii biblici N. T. in reg. Hung. scientiarum universitate Budapestiensi. Friburgi, Brisgoviae: Herder, 1902. 8°, pp. iv + 446.

This work deserves a prominent place in the list of excellent treatises on Biblical Hermeneutics. The book is intended for use in

seminaries and also as a handbook for more profound study. A larger type distinguishes the principal theses with their necessary explanations from the more profuse discussions. This well adapts the book for its two fold purpose.

The prolegomena contain the definition, division, necessity, sources, and history of hermeneutics. The reader will find the pages on the history of biblical hermeneutics especially attractive. They show the gradual development of the science and give an excellent bibliography. Throughout the work the author has not neglected to give the principal authorities under the various chapters, which adds much to the value of the book.

The treatise proper is divided into three parts: the first considers the sense (*theoria sensus, hæmatica*); the second discovery of the sense (*investigatio sensus, heuristica*); the third, the exposition of the sense (*propositio sensus, prophoristica*).

The author gives almost twenty-five pages to the first part. His definitions are clear, easily understood and generally very exact. The importance of a firm grasp of the difference between the verbal and real sense and between the symbolical and typical justly lead us to wish for a longer discussion.

The greater part of the book is taken up with the discovery of the sense. The author follows the most logical plan, treating in order the rational interpretation, Christian interpretation, and Catholic interpretation. The Bible is indeed a Divine book, but the words expressing the thoughts are human, and the manner of expression is modified by circumstances of time and place, by the condition of the persons for whom the sacred books were primarily written and by the subjective dispositions and qualifications of the writers. Dr. Székely therefore speaks of the logical, rhetorical and psychologico-historical sense. In condensed form he gives a good idea of the rhetoric of the sacred writings, of the character of the biblical poetry, and the peculiarities in the language of the Bible.

A discussion of the nature, possibility, necessity and extent of inspiration serves as an introduction to the pages explaining the laws of Christian interpretation. The distinction of inspiration into positive and negative is not very happily chosen nor very clear. Positive inspiration, says the learned author, required, first, *motionem ad scribendum*, second, *influxum positivum in intellectum*, scilicet *intimationem notionum novarum*, and third, *directionem voluntatis*. In negative inspiration the first and third of these acts are the same as in the positive, but the *positivus influxus in intellectum* is absent, and in place of it we have *impeditionem meram erroris*. The

distinction can be easily understood. Dr. Szikely very properly considers the systems of the Jews and rationalists as opposed to the laws of Christian interpretation. Though rationalists are one in eliminating from the Bible all that is supernatural, the methods they follow to attain this end are many and various. The author describes their systems in a very interesting manner.

The laws for interpreting Scripture are modified by the rule of faith and therefore the laws of Catholic interpretation must be opposed to the Protestant systems where the Bible alone is recognized as a guide. The author closes this second part with a very useful article on the attitude of the Church in regard to the reading of Sacred Scripture.

The history of biblical exegesis is very instructive. The author details the progress of exegesis among the Jews. Christian exegesis began with Christ, was carried on by the apostles and early writers, flourished especially in the schools of Alexandria and Antioch, and among the Latin Fathers. Dr. Szikely then traces the development during the Middle Ages, continuing the list of Catholic exegetes down to our own time, and mentioning in a separate paragraph the principal Protestant interpreters. Dr. Szikely has given us an admirable book, written in pure, simple, correct language, a book that will be appreciated by every student.

JOHN G. SCHMIDT.

Der Schöpfungsbericht Der Genesis, mit Berücksichtigung der neuesten Entdeckungen und Forschungen erklärt von Fr. Vinc. Zapletal, O.P., Ord. Professor der alttest. Exegese an der Universität Fribourg (Schweiz). Fribourg: B. Veith, 1902. 8°, pp. vi + 104.

The author well compares the literature on the first chapter of Genesis to a great pyramid. Many books have been written on the scriptural account of creation and we suspect that many more will be written before the problem is finally and satisfactorily solved. Fr. Zapletal's work should be welcomed as a scientific contribution. He shows a thorough acquaintance with the latest writers and newest discoveries. He leaves aside questions no longer of interest and discusses the controversies of the present.

In the first chapter the author justifies the assumption that Genesis I, 1-II, 3, is a complete and independent record. The second account is so different in form and order, that the two cannot be traced to the same source of information. Genesis II, 4, is not a conclusion of the first account, nor is it the title to what follows, but is a later addition.

In the second chapter the author examines the text critically and exegetically. The treatise is brief but thorough, with constant reference to the best and latest writers. The discussion of the word "Bara" is very interesting. The reasons for and against the meaning, *creatio prima ex nihilo*, are clearly stated. The Hebrews were influenced by the views of the neighboring people. Their cosmogony cannot be fully understood without a knowledge of the theories current among other nations. The Egyptian, Phœnician and Babylonian cosmogonies are discussed in the third chapter.

Fr. Zapletal next reviews the various explanations of the account of Genesis that have hitherto been given. He classifies the various theories under the literal, ideal, periodistic or mythical interpretation. The author draws the following conclusion: All the systems contain partial truth, but none gives a complete solution. The literal theory justly insists that the writers of this chapter uses the word "day" in its natural meaning; the ideal explanation is not wrong in asserting that the order of the works of creation is not necessarily historical; mythicism is not mistaken in finding words from Oriental mythologies in Genesis; the periodistic theory is right in contending that creation did not take place in six natural days but extends over various periods. But because each system contains truth in part only, a final solution must be sought elsewhere. We need a system that will combine and harmonize the truths already established and will give a satisfactory answer to difficulties still remaining.

Fr. Zapletal's explanation of the biblical account of creation is: the author wished to teach his readers that the world was created by God without the assistance of any intermediary Demiurge; that the world is anthropocentric; that the Sabbath must be kept as a day of rest. The account is apologetic in character. The neighboring people adored the sun, moon, and stars; worshipped animals, plants, and other creatures. The Israelites are here told that all these have been brought into existence by the word *Elohim*. To be clear and pointed, the author had to adapt his language to the time and people, take into consideration their views. He offered a plan of creation which could be understood easily and which might serve as a substitute for the current heathen cosmogonies. The writer can speak of light on the first day and of the sun on the fourth because the popular mind considered light independent from the sun.

What was the scheme of creation as intended by the writer of Genesis? Fr. Zapletal finds the key for its solution in Gen. II, 1. The scholastics speak of "*opus distinctionis et opus ornatus.*" They depended on the Latin translation: *Igitur perfecti sunt coeli et terra*

et omnis ornatus eorum. This must be corrected to read "exercitus eorum." The two ternaries are "productio regionum et productio exercituum." This explains why the plants are mentioned on the third day. Without the plants the earth would not have been prepared to receive the army which was to inhabit it. In the last chapter the author treats of the literary and historical characters of this account.

JOHN G. SCHMIDT.

De Libri Baruch Vetustissima Latina Versione usque adhuc inedita in celeberrimo Codice Cavensi, Epistola Ambrosii M. Amelli Archivarii Casinensis ad Antonium M. Ceriani Præfectum Bibliothecæ Ambrosianæ. Typis Archicœnobii Montis Casini, 1902. 8°, pp. 15.

The untiring efforts of the Benedictines and of Don Ambrogio Amelli, the scholarly archivist of Monte Casino, are again manifested in this study of the Book of Baruch. These pages offer a specimen from a recension heretofore unedited and supposed by scholars of repute to be one of the oldest versions of Baruch, found in the famous Cavensis Codex. This Codex was written in Spain in Visigothic characters, by Danila, and is preserved at present in the Benedictine Abbey of Corpi di Cava, near Salerno. Such scholars as Wordsworth, Berger, Zeigler, Coorsen and others favor the antiquity of this Codex, but there is no agreement as to its date. Cardinal Mai places it between the seventh and eighth centuries, though others put it as late as the tenth century.

Don Amelli, after a thorough critical study of it, in the light of other Visigothic codices preserved at Monte Casino, is of the opinion that its date is not earlier than the ninth century. The specimen of this version of the Book of Baruch is taken from the third chapter, verses twenty-four to thirty-seven. In this small portion, Amelli notes some remarkable likenesses between the Codex Cavensis and Sabatier's edition of the Vulgate (V), the Codex Casinensis (C), and the text of the Ambrosian Missal (A). From the concordance between these Books and their slight differences Don Amelli concludes: (1) Texts A. C. V. depend upon the Codex Cavensis as on a common archetype, so they are three recensions of one and the same version. (2) Codex Cavensis agrees with A and C more than with V; thus A and C rather constitute one text and are one recension.

Don Amelli believes that this version of the book of Baruch came into use before 347 A. D. From the wording of the version it is easily

proved that the "Epistola" attached to the book of Baruch was really from the "Vetus," while the Liber belonged to that Vulgate which Jerome has styled "Communis," because in common ecclesiastical use from the remotest times. The græcisms of the version and its latinity betray the plebeian language, so much disliked after the days of Damasus and Jerome. In Codex Cavensis, "plebs" appears not infrequently; but the new Vulgate substitutes "populus."

Another interesting feature of the Codex is the marginal annotation. In the margin of Micheas V, 2 is written in purely Visigothic characters: "In LXX habet: domus Ephrata modicus es ut sis in milibus Iude." Jerome in his commentary on Micheas has "et tu Bethleem domus Ephrata nequaquam minima es ut sis in millibus Iuda." But in the Vulgate we read: Et tu Bethleem domus Ephrata modicus es ut sis in milibus Juda.

Probably the author of these notes was some pious monk, as seems evident from the following allusions to the question of predestination. In the margin of Acts XV, 18, we find: "Audiant hoc testimonium qui predestinationem, non ex præscientia sicuti est, sed proposito et voluntate divina dicunt esse decretam." Acts XV, 20, "Audiant hæc qui pene homnia quæ venatione capiuntur suffocatum manducant." The date of this annotator may have been from A. D. 848 to 855, for in Gaul about that time, the question of predestination was being much discussed. In fact three councils, at Mayence in 848, at Quiersy in 849, and at Valence in 855, were held against the monk Gottschalk who died for his opinions on this mystery.

The study of Don Amelli, so recently honored by an appointment to the Biblical Commission, is of value not only to the student of Sacred Scripture, but also to the philologist, and is a new proof of the genuine interest which the Benedictines have ever kept up in all that pertains to ancient ecclesiastical literature.

HENRY I. STARK.

Histoire des Livres du Nouveau Testament. Par E. Jacquier. Tome I. Lecoffre, 1903. Pp. xi + 488.

This is one of many volumes forming, when united, the "Bibliothèque de l'Enseignement de l'Histoire Ecclésiastique," an enterprise for which the great publishing house of Lecoffre has assumed the responsibility. When completed, it promises to give to readers of the laity and of the clergy an excellent series of manuals on the origin and on the development of the Christian religion.

The present volume deals with the life and writings of the Apostle Paul. It will be followed by other volumes on the Gospels, on the

Acts, on the Catholic Epistles, and on the Apocalypse. The first two chapters of the volume deal with such preliminary questions as the chronology and the language of the New Testament. The author places the birth of our Lord in the third or fourth year before the Christian era, the beginning of his public life in the twenty-sixth or in the twenty-eighth year, and the Crucifixion in the twenty-ninth or thirtieth year of the Christian era. According to this calculation our Lord was about thirty-three years of age at the time of his death. St. Paul was converted to Christianity about the year A. D. 34, that is to say, about four or five years after the Ascension. His apostolic journeys began about A. D. 44 and continued to A. D. 60-62. His martyrdom took place at Rome in A. D. 67. Our author places, as is generally done, the Epistles to the Thessalonians first in order of time among the writings of the Apostles. They were written towards the close of the year 52, and during the early part of Paul's residence at Corinth. The Epistle to the Hebrews is the last in the order of time. The composition of this splendid Epistle M. Jacquier does not ascribe in very positive terms to the Apostle.

Considering the number and the variety of the subjects discussed, we have no hesitation in affirming that this is one of the most thorough and independent investigations of New Testament history that has appeared among Catholics for some time.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Mystery of Sleep. By John Bigelow, LL.D. Second Edition. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1903. 8°, pp. xiii + 215.

This is not a technical, psychological study of sleep phenomena, but an attempt to determine the value of sleep as a recuperative process for the upbuilding of the spiritual, as opposed to the sensible life. The author discusses in a popular way the problem why we spend one third of our lives in an unconscious state. He endeavors to dispel some popular delusions that sleep is merely a state of rest, of practical inertia of body and soul, or at most a periodical provision for the reparation of physical waste. Sleep dissociates us from the world in which we live, interrupts all conscious relations with the phenomenal world and thus becomes one of the vital processes of spiritual regeneration. Our moral side has been free, secluded from all the distractions of the world, and thus affords our spirit help to a direct, prolonged and undisturbed communion with God. Sleep helps our moral growth, thus infants sleep longer than adults. Fatigue does not create a need for repose, for if so, argues Mr. Bigelow, why should the octogenarian trembling with weakness sleep less?

Fatigue in its nature, the author does not discuss. Then the desire and the necessity for sleep should be regarded as a providential arrangement to induce us to cultivate the virtues most favorable to its enjoyment, just as hunger and thirst are the agents of Providence for teaching us to be frugal, industrious, and temperate, that they may be reasonably gratified.

HENRY I. STARK.

Sermons and Discourses. Vol. II. By Rev. John McQuirk, D.D., LL.D. New York: St. Paul's Library, 1903. 8°.

This volume is published with the view of contributing to the restoration of family reading, a custom once quite prevalent and productive of much fruit, but now almost obsolete. There can be no doubt that the success of the preacher depends upon a clearly recognized and acted-upon duty on the part of the faithful to profit by his preaching. So the author gives a volume of sermons which are well done, very readable, replete with good thought, plain, pleasant and persuasive. The sermons on the Real Presence, Christian Charity, Infallibility, the Holy Ghost, are especially worthy of attention for the solidity of their expression and the soundness of their theology. The volume is well deserving of the perusal of the clergy and laity alike; we hope it will contribute to the restoration of the beautiful and Christian custom of family-reading.

HENRY I. STARK.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

A Little Chaplet for the Queen of Angels, or A Short Meditation for every evening in May. By Rev. B. J. Raycroft, M.A. New York: Pustet, 1903. 8°, pp. 137.

Wreaths of Song from a Course of Divinity. Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, 1903. 8°, pp. 80.

The Sheriff of Beach Fork, a Story of Kentucky. By Henry S. Spalding, S.J. New York: Benziger, 1903. 8°, pp. 223.

Nothing New, A few words of hope and Confidence, etc. By Rev. Patrick J. Murphy. New York: H. C. Clinton, 413 W. 59th St., 1903. 12°, pp. 64.

The Our Father analyzed according to the doctrine of St. Thomas Aquinas. By Rev. J. G. Hogan, S.J., translated from the German by a Visitation Nun, Georgetown, D. C. New York: Benziger, 1903. 12°, pp. 22.

The Holy Family Series of Catholic Catechisms, No. 2. By Rev. Francis J. Butler, Priest of the Archdiocese of Boston. Boston: Thomas J. Flynn & Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 249 + 62.

NOTES AND COMMENT.

History of Education.—Father Magevney's articles on the history of modern education will repay the reader. Their original shape as review articles compelled, perhaps, the rather crowded presentation of his materials. There is, occasionally, something of a declamatory tone that detracts from the solid merit of these outlines of a long and interesting development. In a future edition it might be well to add in a separate bibliography the full titles of all the educational works described or used. Le Bec in Normandy (viii, 6) usually reads the Abbey of Bec. In the same number (p. 10) is it not unjust to say of Luther that his temperament was "unæsthetic"? His devotion to music is well known, and his lovely "Frau Musica" is one of the choicest gems of praise that were ever bestowed upon this art. Dr. Bæumker, a Catholic historian of Church music, calls him "ein feiner Kunstkenner, ein grosser Freund und Liebhaber der Musik," in genuine intelligent sympathy with such masters as Josquin de Prés (Zur Geschichte der Tonkunst, Freiburg, 1881, p. 153). Given the scarcity of Catholic literature in English on all that pertains to the history, principles and methods of modern education, these brochures of Fr. Magevney are both welcome and useful. (The Reformation and Education, 1520-1648; Systems and Counter-Systems of Education, 1648-1800, Nos. 8 and 9 of the Pedagogical Truth Library, published by the Cathedral Library Association, New York, 1903, 8°, pp. 56 and 53).

Some New Works of Edification.—In "The Gift of Pentecost" Fr. Meschler offers us a volume of theological considerations on the office and function of the Holy Spirit in the theology and constitution, sacraments and daily life, aspirations and ideals of the Catholic Church. The translation is correct and idiomatic, and there is room for such a work even after the classical text of Cardinal Manning. ("The Gifts of Pentecost," Meditations on the Holy Ghost, by M. Meschler, S.J., translated from the German by Lady Amabel Kerr, St. Louis, Herder, 1903, 8°, pp. xi + 498, \$1.60.) Fr. Girardey offers us an English edition of certain ascetical considerations compiled from the writings of the Jesuit theologian, Fr. Schneider. To them he has added other thoughts and reflexions drawn from the works of Saint Alphonsus. The little book recommends itself to

those whose estate calls them to the higher Christian life, and to others whom the Holy Spirit calls along that mystic path. ("Helps to a Spiritual Life," from the German of Joseph Schneider, S.J., with additions by Rev. Ferreol Girardey, C.S.S.R., New York, Benziger, 1903, 8°, pp. vi + 257, \$1.25.) It is long since we have read a devotional book so admirable for content and temper as this volume of Fr. Clifford. In form and style it leaves little to be desired. Nothing in our literature of piety corresponds to this sanely religious piece of exegesis of the opening lines of each Sunday's liturgy. It is Prayer Book and Homily combined. Throughout, its thought is elevated dignified, healthy, and appeals to every sincere Christian as the expression of genuine religion, removed at once from the insipidity of some books of piety and from the adaphorous or intangible exhortations of others. In the commentary of Fr. Clifford we seem to note a serenity, "sweet reasonableness" and gentle piquancy, such as the troubled modern mind may easily admire, and admiring follow in the paths indicated. ("Introibo," a series of detached readings of the Entrance Versicles of the Ecclesiastical Year, by Rev. Cornelius Clifford, Cathedral Library Association, 534 Amsterdam Ave., New York, 1903, 8°, pp. 304.)

Religion and the Religious Sense.—Is religion worth studying as a great fact of modern life? Is it something visible, measurable, something quite on a level with all the objects of personal and social psychology? Is the religious sense itself something native in man, imperishable, useful? Can we answer these questions, not only from the materials of revelation and tradition, but with the aid of the methods and the conclusions of modern science? To these questions the Abbé Klein, professor in the Institut Catholique of Paris, replies in a very suggestive volume made up of discourses delivered in the Cours Supérieur for young ladies (1897–1901) and in the church of the Sorbonne (1902). The book abounds in luminous *aperçus*, there are breadth and clearness in his vision of the large province of fact that he outlines, and the method that he advocates is based at once on the sanest traditions of Catholic theology and the undeniable advances of modern science. As introductory to a greater work on "Dogma and Apologetics" these pages of the distinguished professor of Paris are replete with good sense and moderation, both of claim and style. The Abbé Klein is well known in France as a translator of American Catholic works and as a genial and sympathetic friend of our country and our institutions. ("Le Fait Religieux et la manière de l'observer," Paris, Lethielleux, 8°, 1903, pp. 212.)

Spiritual Marriage in the Primitive Church.—Dr. Hans Achelis, well and favorably known for his edition of the Canons of Hippolytus, contributes an interesting chapter to the story of platonic love in Roman antiquity. He has collected all the references in primitive ecclesiastical history to the “*Virgines Subintroductæ*,” a peculiar custom or abuse soundly denounced by Saint Cyprian as early as the middle of the third century. According to Dr. Achelis, who follows a hint of Mosheim, this custom vigorously and rightfully rooted out by the bishops of that time, was in reality only a long-enduring reminiscence of the earliest Christian times when such unions were solely spiritual. Intensity of religious enthusiasm, clear vision of the nearness of Christ’s second coming, heroic renunciation of life itself, let alone its pleasures, certain peculiarities of the antique temperament, go far to explain the persistency of these relations, which certain historians only too easily describe as a sheer abuse and a sign of early degeneracy of Christian morality. The study of Dr. Achelis is one of extreme interest for its content, and of equal utility for its fulness and its good method. (“*Virgines Subintroductæ*,” *Ein Beitrag zu I Cor. vii*, Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1902, Marks 2.80.)

A General History of Modern Commerce.—Modern history needs more and more to be studied from the view-point of economico-social movements and progress. It is to this conviction that we owe the many excellent histories of commerce that have seen the light in the last twenty years. Their solid and varied erudition needs to be recast for ordinary readers, likewise the numberless special researches in the history of commerce need to have their conclusions enumerated in some reliable manual. Dr. Webster has done this with great success, and we can recommend his summary of the history of commerce as resting on reliable and exhaustive works. Such a conspectus is of incalculable service to all teachers of history, since it appeals to the spirit the training and the tastes of the majority of our modern states. Dr. Webster uses rather strong language when he says (p. 37) that the Church of the fourth and fifth centuries encouraged brilliant services and festivals to “pamper the fancies of masses of ignorant and rude communicants” and to hold them in subjection. This is the view of a narrow iconoclastic school, and not at all justified by a liberal consideration of the development and preservation of the fine arts by great ecclesiastics from Saint Ambrose to Nicetius of Trier. Moreover, his summary (p. 97) of the merits and demerits of the Church with regard to mediæval commerce does not seem to us fair or complete. He does not count in the incalculable service



of the Church as a consumer and a producer in the Middle Ages, nor the fact that most fairs were held in the vicinity of churches and cathedrals, on the occasion of patron days, nor the decrees of councils in favor of merchants, nor the fact that such trading centres as Venice, the Hanseatic cities, Bruges, were highly religious centres at the same time. We think these pages altogether unsatisfactory and misleading, tainted with old-time Protestant prejudice, and the weakest in an otherwise very good book. ("A General History of Commerce," by William Clarence Webster, Ph.D., Boston, Ginn and Co., 1903, 8°, pp. 526.)

The Early History of Oxford and Cambridge.—We have read with equal pleasure and profit the doctorate dissertation of Mr. James F. Willard on the influence which the royal authority exercised in the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries over the growth of the two sister universities of England. In the definition of membership, in the confirmation and extension of the authority of the chancellor, in the granting of protection against the local civil authorities or "borough," and later of a substantial privileged position in all matters of mixed character, the English kings so cherished these twin seats of learning that by the end of the fourteenth century they had grown from bodies of students held together by a loose code of professional customs or etiquette to a position of almost complete theoretical independence of the local and royal authorities. The clerical chancellors of the sees of Lincoln and Ely had become self-controlling heads of universities formed out of the episcopal schools; the archdeacons' power had waned completely, and in the "borough" each university had gradually secured a dominating influence in all legislation and institution affecting its students. We could have wished that the original ecclesiastical character of the chancellor had been more clearly set forth, also that the numerous positive papal enactments in favor of the universities had been gathered from Bliss' "Calendar of Papal Registers 1198-1362," and worked into a distinct chapter. This step would tend to offset the action of the papacy by that of the national authority and would thereby bring out more clearly the exact limits of the royal action on the development of mediæval Oxford and Cambridge. ("The Royal Authority and the Early English Universities," by James J. Willard, Philadelphia, University of Pennsylvania 1902, 8°, pp. 89.)

Christianity and the Civil Law of Rome.—Among the half forgotten classics of the nineteenth century, one might reckon the work

of M. Troplong entitled "*De l'influence du Christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains*" published first in 1843. The Abbé Bayle, of the diocese of Tours, gives us the latest edition of this indispensable study of the process by which the gradually infiltrating Christian spirit saturated at last the old civil law of Rome. The task was slow and painful, accompanied with many a cessation and reaction—but in the end the gentle charity of Christ affected profoundly that archaic law once so stern and heartless toward slaves, women, and children, so unfeelingly consistent in its application of an artificial family system. The doctrine of M. Troplong is that of one of the most distinguished of modern French juriconsults, and his erudition is everywhere "*de bon aloi*." The sixty-one commentaries of M. Bayle are at once brief and pithy, abounding in good citations that are always apropos and helpful. The book is of much value to every student of Roman law as well as to students of the history of canon law and ecclesiastical institutions. ("*De l'influence du Christianisme sur le droit civil des Romains, Nouvelle édition commentée aux points de vue philosophique, juridique et théologique de tous les temps*," par M. l'Abbé Bayle, Tours, Cattier, 1902, 8°, pp. viii + 259.)

Mediæval Marian Hymns and Canticles.—Out of the forgotten musical lore of the Middle Ages Dom Pothier makes known fifty-six beautiful antiphons, proses, hymns, sequences "*rhythmi*" and canticles, all dealing with the Blessed Virgin, and all, more or less, in the original text. It is a bit of artistic no less than palæographic work. The simple gravity of this music recalls the Romance basilica while its delicacy and sweetness remind one of the sculptured Gothic capital. After the "*Analecta Liturgica*" of Fr. Dreves, there seems to be yet more than one sheaf to be gathered. These texts offer often a profound theology, apt uses of Holy Scripture, archaic simplicity of diction, with a free and original inspiration. Dom Pothier says of them rightly that they are "*egregia pietatis avitæ monumenta*," and compares them picturesquely with the dried flowers that the botanist's herbarium has preserved. ("*Cantus Mariales quos e fontibus antiquis eruit aut opere novo veterum instar concinnavit D. Josephus Pothier abbas sancti Wandregisili, O.S.B.*," Paris, Lethielleux, 1903, 8°, pp. 147.)

M. Amédée Gastoué contributes to the same good cause of Church music, at once traditional and scientific, a little volume that will please all lovers of the mediæval plain chant. It offers a transcription into modern musical terminology of a number of mediæval musical texts whose antiquated neumatic notation can now be read

by few. Without any sacrifice of palæographico-historical accuracy M. Gastoué succeeds in placing before all with photographic exactness specimens of the liturgical chant of the ninth century and later. It is the mediæval music of the ordinary of the mass, the Kyriale, the Missa pro defunctis, vespers, burial service, confirmation, the *toni psalorum*, litanies, Via Crucis, Benediction of the Blessed Sacrament, and the like. ("Les principaux chants liturgiques du chœur et des fidèles, etc., Plain-Chant Grégorien traditionnel d'après les manuscrits," par Amédée Gastoué, Paris, Poussielgue, pp. 200, 1903.)

The Tribes of Latium.—We could not recommend to teachers and students of Latin in the higher classes a more useful and entertaining work than that of the Abbé Dedouvres on the Latin life and character as betrayed in their literature. We have here the substance of Roman literature in as far as it is a popular product, with a point of view that may lay claim to novelty at least in statement. The Latin was eminently a man of the fields and the market place, and his language dealt originally with cows and oxen, beans and peas and fodder, trees and hedges, the plough and the yoke, the furrow and the ditch. He is no poet, no philosopher, by nature, and though eventually he acquires an intellectual realm of poetry, philosophy and drama, he is always less at home in those borrowed habiliments than he is in his law-courts and his fortified camps. This book is well suited to help the youthful scholar to comprehend, in the original sources, the vast difference between the folk-genius of the Latin and the Hellene. ("Les Latins peints par eux-mêmes," Paris, Picard, 1903, 8°, pp. 450.)

An Excellent Modern Work on Divorce.—The second enlarged edition of the book of Dr. Lorenzo Michaelangelo Billia on divorce, first published in 1893, is deserving of perusal by all who are interested in the sancity of the Christian family. It contains many apt considerations, theological, philosophical and historical; the latter are particularly useful. In a series of pertinent notes he adduces the opinions of many prominent scholars and statesmen of the nineteenth century against the growing evil of divorce. The work has actually a very special value since the Italian state threatens to adopt a divorce legislation and thereby to offend the consciences of the majority of the people of the peninsula. ("Difendiamo la famiglia, saggio contro il divorzio e specialments contro la proposta di introdurlo in Italia," Torina, Nuovo Risorgimento, 1902, 8°, pp. 275.)

The Denial of Ecclesiastical Burial in Antiquity.—Professor von Thümmel of Jena bases his description of modern Lutheran discipline in the matter of denial of ecclesiastical burial on a lengthy historical study of the same. With patience he has collected all that seems referable to that subject out of the early ecclesiastical annals, the documents of the Middle Ages, and the history of the Church down to our own time. The historical facts are of more than ordinary interest when mustered in orderly array. The brochure will have a permanent value to historians of ecclesiastical discipline, even if the standpoint of Professor Thümmel be the partisan confessional one. (*“Die Versagung der kirchlichen Bestattungsfeier, ihre geschichtliche Entwicklung und gegenwärtige Bedeutung, Hinrichs, Leipzig, 1902, 8°, pp. 196, Marks 2.80.”*)

The Katipunan and the Filipino Commune.—The principles and methods of Filipino Freemasonry, or what passes for it, are explained in this pamphlet of 283 pages. The reader may make therein acquaintance with the marvelous charm that secret societies exercise over the Oriental mind, and the grave danger they constitute for the ordinary civil authority whenever it is distasteful to them. The actual perils of the neighboring Chinese state are an instructive comment on the tenacity and efficiency of these subterraneous organizations. It is a pity that this work of reference should be provided with neither table of contents nor alphabetical index. (*The Katipunan, or the Rise and Fall of the Filipino Commune, Boston, T. J. Flynn and Co., 1903, 3d ed., pp. 283.*)

Portraits of Julius Cæsar.—Mr. Frank J. Scott has added a valuable chapter to the classic *“Roemische Ikonographie”* of Bernouilli by the publication of some thirty-six marble heads, profiles, statues, coins, casts, busts, masks and statuettes that purport to represent the figure and features of the “foremost man of all the world.” The illustrations are accompanied by an erudite and critical text that lends especial value to this work. (*Portraits of Julius Cæsar, Longmans, New York, 8°, pp. 182.*)

The New Dioceses in Cuba.—We owe to the courtesy of Archbishop Chapelle, Apostolic Delegate to Cuba and Porto Rico, a copy of the Papal Brief, *“Actum Præclare”* by which two new dioceses, Pinar del Rio and Cienfuegos, have been established in the island, also three parishes cut off from Havana and added to the archdiocese of Santiago. Photographs of the new cathedrals and an ecclesiastical map of Cuba accompany the valuable document.

INSTALLATION OF THE NEW RECTOR.

The Rt. Rev. Denis Joseph O'Connell, M.A., D.D., was installed as third Rector of the Catholic University of America on Wednesday, April 23, by His Eminence the Chancellor in presence of the Board of Trustees assembled for their Annual Meeting.

Mgr. O'Connell is a native of South Carolina. He was educated in the public schools and at St. Mary's College, Columbia, S. C., whence he entered Saint Charles' College in Maryland in 1868. He graduated therefrom in 1871 and in the same year began the study of philosophy and theology at Rome, as a student of the American College. He spent five years in these studies and in June, 1877, was ordained a priest. In July of the same year he was declared Doctor of Theology after a public examination which won for him the unanimous vote of his professors. In August, 1877, he returned to his diocese of Richmond, but was shortly afterward, in September of the same year, sent to Rome as the postulator for the pallium for Cardinal Gibbons, recently made Archbishop of Baltimore. In February, 1878, he returned to the United States and for several years had charge of various missions along the James River in Virginia. As pastor of Winchester he dedicated in 1883 the Church built at Front Royal through the generosity of the Jenkins family of Baltimore.

In October, 1883, he was sent to Rome to prepare for the Third Plenary Council of Baltimore. He returned in January, 1884, and was constantly employed during the following months in the preparation of the Council, its promulgation, the extensive correspondence that followed, and in preparing at Saint Charles College, in company with the distinguished theologians of the Council, the decrees of the same. In the Council itself he was one of the four principal secretaries, the others being Mgr. Corcoran, Dr. Messmer and Dr. Gabriels—the latter two are now respectively bishops of Green Bay and Ogdensburg. In March, 1885, Mgr. O'Connell returned to

Rome with the decrees of the Council, to submit them, as is the ancient custom, to the Holy See for approbation. Bishops Moore, Gilmour, and Dwenger went at the same time as a committee of the American episcopate. In June of that year he was made Rector of the American College at Rome, but did not assume the duties of that office until the spring of 1886. In the meantime he was occupied with the printing and final publication of the legislation prepared by the Council.

As Rector of the American College, Mgr. O'Connell devoted close attention to multiplying the number of students, providing for their greater physical comfort, and placing the finances of the College on a solid basis. During his incumbency, six life-scholarships were founded, all debts paid off, and a notable sum left in the treasury of the institution. During the same period, he was constantly at the service of the American episcopate, a task that meant much self-sacrifice and devotion, since at that time the Apostolic Delegation to the United States had not yet been established.

Thus, during the year 1886, he aided His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons in the now famous question of the condemnation of the Knights of Labor. The counsel and services of Mgr. O'Connell were constantly called on during this important episode. Similarly, he coöperated with Archbishops Keane and Ireland in the matter of the Constitutions and papal approval for the University that was being founded at Washington. In October, 1892, he accompanied Archbishop Satolli as papal representative to the Committee of Archbishops. Shortly afterwards Archbishop Satolli was raised to the position of first Apostolic Delegate to the Catholic Church in the United States. Since 1896 Mgr. O'Connell has held the office of Vicar of His Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, in his cardinalitial church of Santa Maria in Trastevere.

From this brief statement of the career of Mgr. O'Connell, it will be seen that he brings to the University ripe and varied experience. His acquaintance with the problems and needs of the Catholic Church in the United States has been gained at first hand, and in daily contact with the hierarchy and the Roman authorities. His acquired knowledge, quick sympathy

with all noble educational ideals, and other similar qualities, give every reason to trust that his administration will be a successful one; that it will justify all the hopes aroused by his nomination, and leave the University in every sense an assured fact.

RT. REV. THOMAS J. CONATY, D.D.

Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D.D., received in April the papal brief appointing him to the see of Los Angeles, as successor to the Rt. Rev. George Montgomery, D.D., who was recently designated Coadjutor to the Archbishop of San Francisco.

Dr. Conaty was named second Rector of the University by Pope Leo XIII., November 22, 1896, and was installed January 19, 1897. He was promoted to the dignity of Domestic Prelate June 2, 1897, and was consecrated, November 24, 1901, Bishop of Samos.

The term of Dr. Conaty's rectorship began shortly after the Schools of Philosophy and of the Social Sciences had been added to the School of Theology. This development of the University involved numerous problems and details of organization which could be settled only as time and experience suggested a solution. Dr. Conaty's efforts were accordingly directed, in the first instance, upon the internal relations of the University—the coördination of the various departments in the several schools and the consolidation of all the schools with a view to greater efficiency. To this work the Rector brought a knowledge of educational conditions which enabled him to adjust university requirements and policy to the needs of the secondary schools without lowering the standards of the University itself.

The same period witnessed an active growth of the institutions immediately connected with the University. Considerable additions were made to St. Thomas' College, the novitiate of the Paulist Fathers. The Marists, in 1897, transferred their College to the new building adjoining the grounds of the University, and, in 1902, began the construction of a second building for their Juniorate. In 1899, the new College of the Holy Cross was opened. In the same year, the Franciscans dedicated their College of the Holy Land. The Sulpicians opened St. Austin's College, their house of studies, in 1901; the

Dominicans purchased, in 1902, the ground on which they are now erecting their college; and, in the same year, arrangements were made for the location, on the University grounds, of the Apostolic Mission House, whose first students had found a temporary residence in Keane Hall. Provision was also made for the higher education of women under Catholic auspices by the establishment of Trinity College, which opened its courses in 1900. The varied interests represented by these religious communities necessitated a careful study of their relations to the University, and of the whole question of affiliation, which was finally placed, towards the end of Dr. Conaty's rectorship, upon a definite basis.

While these movements were grouping the orders about the University, Dr. Conaty was equally earnest in his endeavor to make the University the center of Catholic education in the United States. The Holy See, in giving the University its constitution, urged this unification of our institutions; and the Rector used all his influence to make the Catholic system a concrete reality. With this object in view, he organized the Conference of Catholic Colleges and presided at its annual meetings, the first of which was held in 1899. A similar impetus was given to the work of the theological seminaries and, quite recently, to the work of elementary instruction in the parochial schools.

In the conduct of these different undertakings, within the University and without, Dr. Conaty was uniformly courteous and forbearing. While deeply interested in making the University a power for good in the country at large, he was no less solicitous in maintaining its high standards. That the same breadth of view will characterize his action in the new field of labor to which he is called, there can be no doubt. The success which awaits him there will be the natural outcome of sincere and laborious efforts in pursuit of worthy ideals. We wish him a hearty godspeed in the work of episcopal administration. The diocese of Los Angeles will find in him a fatherly ruler, well acquainted with the real needs of our American Catholic population, unsparing of himself, and filled with that large charity that is the outcome of manifold experience with all kinds and conditions of men.

COMMENCEMENT EXERCISES, 1902-1903.

The commencement exercises were held, as usual, in the Assembly Room, McMahon Hall, Wednesday, June 10, at 10 A. M., in the presence of a distinguished assembly of clergy and laity. After a brief introductory discourse by the Dean of the Faculty of Theology on the origin and nature of university degrees, the successful candidates were presented to the Rt. Rev. Rector by their respective Deans. At the close of the simple but impressive ceremony the Rt. Rev. Rector delivered a discourse of encouragement to the assembled students, in which he brought out strongly the fact that theological studies were of a necessity the living center of a Catholic University. The harmonious union of all the sciences was the true ideal of the members of a university, and this ideal could best be realized when all coöperated to raise to her proper position the oldest and the most queenly of all. Theology had, indeed, to receive illustration and coöperation from all other sciences, but she in turn was destined to bring to all of them a still nobler benefit, viz, the knowledge of God, His place in the universe and its relations to Him. After the ceremony, refreshments were served to the assembled guests and an informal reception was held by the Rt. Rev. Rector.

The degrees conferred were as follows:

Bachelor of Laws (LL.B.).

McQuilkin DeGrange,

Frederick, Md.

A.B. (Johns Hopkins University) 1900.

William Augustine Feuchs,

Wurtsboro, N. Y.

Frank Joseph Noonan,

Creston, Iowa.

Master of Laws (LL.M.).

James Richard Lawlor,

Waterbury, Conn.

LL.B. (Southwestern Baptist University, Jackson, Tenn.) 1902.

Doctor of Law (J.D.).

Kiyomihi Seshimo,

Tokio, Japan.

LL.B. (Tokio Hogakuin Law College) 1888.

Dissertation:—"A Comparative Review of the Patent Systems of the Leading Countries of Europe, America and Asia."

Doctor of Civil Law (D.C.L.).

Theodore Papazoglow Ion,

Smyrna, Turkey.

LL.B. (Faculté de Droit, Paris), LL.L. (ibid.), J.D. (The Catholic University of America) 1899.

Dissertation:—"Comparative Study of the Roman Law with the Mahometan Jurisprudence and of the Influence of the Former on the Latter."

- John Weitzel Forney Smith, *Washington, D. C.*
 LL.B. (Columbia University) 1892; LL.M. (ibid.) 1893.
 Dissertation:—"The Historical Evolution of the Pretorian Law."

Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.).

- Rev. Charles Albert Dubary, S.M., *Washington, D. C.*
 S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1899.
 Dissertation:—"The Theory of Psychical Dispositions."
 Rev. Thomas Verner Moore, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 Dissertation:—"A Study in Reaction-Time and Movement."

Bachelor in Sacred Theology (S.T.B.).

- Rev. John Walter Healy Corbett, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 A.B. (Fordham College) 1898; A.M. (Georgetown University) 1899.
 Rev. John Edward Flood, *Archdiocese of Philadelphia.*
 A.B. (Catholic High School, Philadelphia) 1895.
 Rev. Emil Lawrence Gerardi, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 A.B. (St. Francis College, Quincy, Ill.) 1899; A.M. (ibid.) 1900.
 Rev. John Joseph Greaney, *Diocese of Pittsburg.*
 A.B. (Manhattan College) 1898.
 Rev. Ralph Hunt, *Archdiocese of San Francisco.*
 Rev. William Patrick McNamara, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1899.
 Rev. Edward Joseph Mullaly, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 A.B. (St. Mary's College, Oakland, Cal.) 1899.
 Rev. Michael Joseph Neufeld, *Archdiocese of New York.*
 Rev. Jerome Louis O'Hern, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 Rev. William Ignatius Phelan, *Diocese of Springfield.*
 A.B. (Holy Cross College, Worcester) 1898.
 Rev. John Peter Ries, S.M., *Washington, D. C.*
 Rev. John Gerard Schmidt, *Archdiocese of St. Louis.*
 Rev. Henry Joseph Seiller, S.M., *Washington, D. C.*
 Rev. Henry Ignatius Stark, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
 A.B. (St. Mary's College, Oakland) 1899.
 Rev. Matthew Aloysius Schumacher, C.S.C., *Washington, D. C.*
 A.B. (Notre Dame University) 1899.

Licentiate in Sacred Theology (S.T.L.).

- Rev. William Patrick Clark, *Archdiocese of Cincinnati.*
 S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Authorship of the Epistle to the Hebrews: A Study of some early Christian Evidences in the Alexandrian Church."
 Rev. John Joseph Crane, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
 Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1898; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"The Synoptic Question: Its History and Present Standing."
 Rev. Thomas Gaffney, *Archdiocese of Chicago.*
 A.B. (Christian Brothers' College, St. Louis) 1888; A.M. (ibid.) 1890; B.S. (ibid.) 1893; A.B. (St. Viator's College, Bourbonnais, Ill.) 1897; A.M. (ibid.) 1900;
 S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1901.
 Dissertation:—"The Bible a Witness to Its Own Inspiration."
 Rev. James Aloysius Gallagher, *Archdiocese of Philadelphia.*
 A.B. (La Salle College, Philadelphia) 1893; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.
 Dissertation:—"St. Paul's Testimony to the Credibility of the Gospel Narrative as regards the Resurrection of Christ."

Rev. James Martin Gillis, C.S.P., *New York, N. Y.*
Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1898; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.

Dissertation:—"The Agapé: Its Existence and its Relation with The Holy Eucharist."

Rev. William Hugh Grant, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1898; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.

Dissertation:—"The History and Criticism of the 'Satisfaction Idea' in the Doctrine of the Atonement."

Rev. Thomas Patrick Heverin, *Archdiocese of San Francisco.*
A.B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore) 1895; A.M. (ibid.) 1896; S.T.B. (ibid.) 1899.

Dissertation:—"Authority and Reason and the Relations Between Them."

Rev. Timothy Peter Holland, S.S., * *Moir, N. Y.*
A.B. (Ottawa University) 1896; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.

Dissertation:—"The Condition of the English Clergy in the Last Half of the Fourteenth Century."

Rev. James Patrick McGraw, *Diocese of Syracuse.*
A.B. (Manhattan College, New York) 1897; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.

Dissertation:—"Excommunication in the First Three Centuries: A Study in Church Discipline."

Rev. Thomas Edward McGuigan, *Archdiocese of Baltimore.*
A.B. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore) 1897; A.M. (ibid.) 1898; S.T.B. (ibid.) 1900.

Dissertation:—"Origen in Reply to Celsus."

Rev. William Bernard Martin, *Archdiocese of New York.*
A.B. (St. Francis Xavier's College, New York) 1897; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.

Dissertation:—"Religion among the Huron, Iroquois, and Algonkin Indians: An Historical Study based upon the Relations of the Jesuits."

Rev. Leo Francis O'Neil, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
A.B. (Boston College) 1897; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.

Dissertation:—"The Doctrine of Original Sin in the First Four Centuries: A Positive Study."

Rev. John Stephen Shanahan, *Archdiocese of Dubuque.*
S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1902.

Dissertation:—"The Constitution of the Church as portrayed in the Ignatian Epistles."

Doctor in Sacred Theology (S.T.D.).

Rev. Patrick Joseph Healy, *Archdiocese of New York.*
S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1898; S.T.L. (ibid.) 1899.

Dissertation:—"The Valerian Persecution (A. D. 257-260)."

Rev. John Webster Melody, *Archdiocese of Chicago.*
A.B. (St. Ignatius College, Chicago) 1885; A.M. (St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore) 1887; S.T.B. (ibid.) 1889; S.T.L. (The Catholic University of America) 1893.

Dissertation:—"The Physical Basis of Marriage."

Rev. Maurice Joseph O'Connor, *Archdiocese of Boston.*
Ph.B. (St. John's Seminary, Brighton) 1894; S.T.B. (The Catholic University of America) 1898; S.T.L. (ibid.) 1899.

Dissertation:—"Responsibility and the Moral Life."

THE UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

The Dominican House of Studies.—Ground was broken on Wednesday, April 23, for the new Dominican House of Studies, on the Bunker Hill road, opposite the University. Cardinal Gibbons conducted the ceremony, surrounded by many members of the episcopate and clergy. This institution will form a quadrangle of 200 feet each way, and will be a notable addition to the group of buildings located on the grounds or in the immediate vicinity of the University.

The Apostolic Mission House.—On Wednesday, April 23, the corner-stone of the new Apostolic Mission House was laid by Cardinal Gibbons, in the presence of many members of the episcopate and clergy and a large concourse of laity. The sermon was delivered by the Most Rev. Archbishop Keane of Dubuque.

The new building will be erected under the auspices of the Catholic Missionary Union, a corporation organized six years ago under the laws of the State of New York for the purpose of placing missionaries in the south and west of this country. The new institution will be national in character, in that the diocesan priests from the various dioceses of the United States will receive training for missionary work within its walls.

The Mission House will cost about \$50,000. It faces Bunker Hill road and will occupy a plot of ground 200 feet square located near the easterly gate of the campus, and about 400 feet from Keane Hall. The site has been leased by the University Trustees to the Catholic Missionary Union for an indefinite period. The basement of the building will include the kitchen and apartments for the employes, the storerooms and the boiler rooms. On the first floor will be a large chapel and a few class rooms. The remainder of the building will consist of private rooms.

Gift of Books from Bishop Messmer.—The University has received from Bishop Messmer, of Green Bay a gift of more than 150 valuable books. It returns him sincere thanks for this expression of his continued interest in the library of the Faculty of Theology.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

VOL. IX.

OCTOBER, 1903.

No. 4.

"Let there be progress, therefore; a widespread and eager progress in every century and epoch, both of individuals and of the general body, of every Christian and of the whole Church, a progress in intelligence, knowledge and wisdom, but always within their natural limits and without sacrifice of the identity of Catholic teaching, feeling and opinion."—ST. VINCENT OF LERINS, *Commonit*, c. 6.

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY
THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA,
LANCASTER, PA., AND WASHINGTON, D. C.

PRESS OF
THE NEW ERA PRINTING COMPANY,
LANCASTER, PA.

The Catholic University Bulletin.

Vol. IX.

October, 1903.

No. 4.

LEO XIII.

The great personalities of history justly demand from their critics a large background of time. They are not unlike the great phenomena of nature and the great masterpieces of the artist that in one way or another overwhelm the onlooker. His troubled judgment regains its poise and security only when it is free to compare, to estimate relatively, and to master piece-meal the unusual and the extraordinary. It is not too bold to say that we understand Julius Cæsar better to-day than his contemporaries did, that we are better informed on the growth of the Roman city than Livy, that the full significance of the French Revolution is only now dawning on our minds. Such thoughts are not unnatural when we come to deal with Leo XIII, no longer as the pilot at the wheel, but as *functus officio*, called home to render an account of his long and memorable pontificate. The papacy is preeminently a service of the Christian world—for immemorial ages the pope has loved to style himself “the servant of the servants of God.” The natural criterion, therefore, of any pontificate is the service rendered the Christian cause. The person of every pope is usually merged in the work of his great office. The great majority were heads of the Church for the time being, and are remembered only as such. Occasionally, however, a giant personality appears on the scene, and so dominates by strength of character, fixity of will, and clearness of vision, the multitudinous forces of the Church that they bear for a long time the

impress of his direction. Leo XIII was such a pope, and we may believe that his name will never cease to shine with peculiar brilliancy in the catalogue of those Bishops of Rome who did most to realize the purpose of their high office, who saw to it that the "*Respublica Christianorum*" suffered no detriment and that the boundaries of its spiritual influence were widened and consolidated.

He has been called the last of the mediæval popes, and there is some truth in the assertion. The intellectual revolt that began with Martin Luther has rounded itself out with a certain universality and finality only in our own days. The political changes inaugurated by the French Revolution have reached a certain fixity of type in all that pertains to the government of humanity—in one way or another the actual will of the people is the predominant factor. For over a century the legislations of Europe have been undergoing modification and adaptation to the new circumstances of civil life. In the material order a century of invention lies behind us that has profoundly modified all past influences of space and time on human affairs. Our native earth has been thrown open from pole to pole, and its last secret places given over to universal curiosity and utility. Nor could these new conditions of human life have reached their present "*assiette*" without affecting the temperament of the average man. He has become more cosmopolitan, more conscious of natural rights, more proud of his rights and capacities, more inclined to make himself the measure of all things. Printing now scatters all men's thoughts with the velocity and accuracy of the subtlest forces of nature. Travel and reading have made of history and geography educational forces in a sense and a degree hitherto unconceivable. Whatever be the outcome of this far-reaching revolution there can be no doubt that civilized humanity has finally moved out and away from the political, social, and economic conditions of the past; that in the Western world, at least, as compared with the Orient, the end of one great era coincides with the opening of another.

When Leo XIII took up in 1878 the succession of Pius IX, all this was true; since then each decade has more strikingly accentuated such considerations. Naturally, they were the

very first to commend themselves to a bishop grown old in the service of Catholicism, and finally raised to its supreme government amid local and general circumstances of a kind more complex and adverse than had surrounded the papacy for centuries. His resources were neither few nor contemptible. He had around him a corps of bishops who were the flower of Catholic education and life, most of them prominent factors in all the religious and mixed problems of the time, and many of them veteran centurions in the unceasing warfare of ideas, systems and policies. The pope is no Inca, no Grand Llama, and though his directive and judicial powers are great, they are translated into acts and systematic efficiency by reason of the episcopate. He is the "episcopus episcoporum," but no one recognizes more readily, or has confessed more eloquently, than the Bishop of Rome that his brethren share the same apostolic origin, the same divine mandate, the same unfailing promises. Leo XIII could also count on the vast and universal institutional strength of Catholicism, both in men and things, a power so intimately interwoven with all civilized life, so rooted in immemorial Catholic habit, so saturated with tenderest affection and holiest hopes, that for efficiency it was like a sixth sense. The humiliations, perils, and degradation of a century had quickened this great force in an incredible degree. A growing charity had informed it with fresh vigor, and the new channels of human intercourse were no less useful to it than the unity of the Roman Empire and the Greek tongue had been to the first missionaries of Catholicism.

In all Catholic lands an identity of doctrine and discipline had been preserved; only archaisms of heresy and schism afflicted the sound remnant of Catholicism that had come through the French Revolution. The Catholic people were united in the Old and the New World; they were confident that the chalice of sufferings had been drained to the dregs, and that amid the new conditions of human life, conditions won by and favorable to the democracy, the Catholic Church could not but find herself again in a position to confirm and consecrate those just rights and aspirations of the common people for which she fought so constantly in the thousand years from Chlodwig to Charles the Fifth, and for defending which she

has ever been detested by those men of violence and cunning, those doctrinaires and bureaucrats, who from century to century afflict mankind with their selfishness and their narrowness.

Such was the equipment of the venerable office of Leo XIII, rated at its highest efficiency, and with reservation of a multitude of local and temporary drawbacks. To these advantages the new pope brought certain peculiar quantities of mind and heart; above all a long experience as Christian shepherd in the heart of a land more than any other given over to the discussion of ecclesiastical questions and interests, where countless thousands of monuments recall daily the beneficent action of Catholicism through twenty centuries, where the character of the people is, in an absolute sense, the creation of Catholicism, and where the language itself, both that of literature and that of its endless dialects, is one enormous thesaurus of the varied influence of religion on the Italian man in his entirety. Thirty years in that old Umbrian stronghold, where one can even now stand in the sombre city-gate built in the time of Augustus and named for him, and look out over the valleys and slopes and knolls made sacred forever to our common humanity by the footsteps and the high dreams of the "Poverello" and his holy brethren—thirty years in such a retired nook of modern life seem to have been a fitting vestibule to the splendid theatre on which Leo XIII was one day to appear as spokesman of Jesus Christ to a humanity bewildered, confused, morally headless and hopeless. Already this humanity was subtly and prophetically conscious that government and legislation, human knowledge and material comfort, were no final and impregnable barrier to certain human instincts that make always for the oppression and enslavement of the multitude, and no less surely to-day than when they were harnessed to the chariot of a Pharaoh, and bore him securely over the prostrate necks of a care-worn and broken-hearted multitude. It was soon seen that in the Vatican there sat a philosopher on the throne of Peter, a Christian philosopher it is true, yet a man of experience well digested, of elevated views, of solid working principles, temperate withal in action and speech, content to stand on a certain common ground with the representatives of a sane and useful conservatism in all that pertained to the

strengthening of Christian life and persuasion among modern men.

Each succeeding year added to the esteem and affection that went out to him from the beginning. Mild and conciliatory by his habit of life, his calling as a priest, and the breadth of his reading and observation, he seems to have felt instinctively that he was moving along a dividing-line in the history of mankind; that his eye was better occupied in forecasting each immediate advance, rather than in dwelling on the silent past that had no clear message for the tangle of new situations which he was called to unravel. He dealt in turn with burning questions and intricate problems that brought him into close personal contact with rulers of nearly all civilized states, as the large annual volumes of his "Acta" make known to us. He found among his clients whole peoples and races approaching him with a novel directness and an affectionate importunity. He held daily confidential conversation with all kinds and conditions of men, from the venerable senators of his council to genuine persecutors of his people and enemies of the faith of Christ. An endless procession of miscellaneous humanity clamored for a view of his person, a word from his lips, a blessing from his aged heart. Probably no pope since the days of Peter was ever in such intimate touch with all the actual currents of human thought and sentiment as Leo XIII. The world of to-day, above all of to-morrow, was his library, and the books of the most value to him were those human hearts that came in throngs to reveal the secret of their woes, the arguments of their hope, the reasons of their despair.

No one lives long in Rome with impunity for any intellectual narrowness he may have brought with him. And a society like that of the nineteenth century, smarting with an undefined sense of injustice that it could not track beyond itself, was the last to escape the soothing influence of a kindly, if aged, physician whose diagnosis of its ills it more than half acknowledged to be true. Behind him there arose dimly the figure of the Ecclesia herself, no longer the caricature of violent and embittered partisans, but the superb matronly figure that fascinated the souls of mediæval men, until they carved it in an immortal eloquence of stone on the walls of Chartres

and Strassburg, and in a no less immortal eloquence of poetry in the *Paradiso* of Dante. Immovable faith and rock-like conviction are a dynamite capable of shattering the most appalling obstacles—they shook and overthrew the Empire of the Cæsars, than which a more reasonable and compact state has not yet appeared among men. They were visible and tangible in the White Shepherd of the Vatican, while the multitude no longer saw them in the universal opportunism of the times, and the equally universal and irresistible decay of the original timbers of Christian faith outside of Catholicism. No doubt many natural reasons conspire to explain the movement of Christian mankind towards Rome in the latter quarter of the nineteenth century. Yet, it is by no stretch of self-interested imagination that the personality of Leo XIII is made to account for this fascination. During more than a quarter of a century of pontificate he had withstood the usual tests of popularity, and revealed in himself a superior human soul rich with all the culture of education and life, liberal and sympathetic in an unexpected degree, in an age of philanthropy devoted without reserve to the welfare of our common society. If his remedies for its woes were only those of the gospel, it was because he had nothing substantial to offer from himself, being no more than a mouthpiece of Jesus Christ, doing for Him vicarious duty, and preaching to all humanity those remedies of the God-Man that can alone allay the fever and the pain of our complicated ills. That he did not preach in vain the great social lessons of the gospel may be inferred from the unexampled outburst of sympathy that his illness and death provoked in the non-Catholic world. When we have made all just deductions, it remains true that for the first time since the death of the tenth Leo has there been anything like a common sorrow among Christians over the death of a common spiritual father. The potential quality of such sympathy is infinite; it honored at once the recipient and the givers. At the least, it added no new barrier to the hope of reconciliation; to some optimistic spirits it appears like the faint flushing of a dawn long-awaited for, when the prayer of Jesus Christ shall again have its fulfilment, and unity of faith be once more a reality among all Christians.

Whatever the future interest of mankind in Leo XIII, the Catholic clergy will long cherish his memory for his unfaltering devotion to the education of its members. The twenty-six volumes of his public documents contain hundreds of references to this all-important subject. Around it is already springing up a notable literature that gives evidence of the deep feelings that have been stirred in every Catholic land and in all Catholic peoples by these clarion notes of Leo XIII. It is not possible that there should be a retrogression—such intellectual currents once let loose are no longer controllable. There is no large department of ecclesiastical science that he has not illustrated by the light of his genuine genius for exposition. He wrote frequently to the Catholic episcopate concerning the creation and reformation of studies in all seminaries. He established academies, high schools, and special institutes at Rome, and encouraged similar works elsewhere. He was prodigal of approval to Catholic scholars, and aided efficiently private literary enterprise likely to honor the cause of Catholicism. It was only to be expected that in these countless utterances he should always insist on the purity and integrity of Catholic faith—but he also insisted on vigor, enterprise, spontaneity in that holy cause. More than one of his crisp phrases has become a watchword to ardent young clerics of France and Germany and Italy. He was a man of inspiring and suggestive power, in whom ardor and ambition for the cause of God were at least the equal of any similar devotion in his own time to purely profane ideals.

The need, scope, and utility of universities, that would not only refrain from injury to the interests of Catholicism, but positively aid them, were never absent from his mind. He knew that any Catholic primary and secondary education that does not culminate in a higher Catholic education of the university type, is only a feeder of infidelity—at long range if you will—but destined either to shut off Catholic youth from the offices, emoluments and benefits of such a higher education, or else to abandon it completely at the end to those very influences against which so great and costly provision had been made in the foundation of Catholic parochial schools, academies and colleges. Wherever an opening occurred for the foundation

of a Catholic university, his coöperation and advice were freely given. His interest in such works was constant and his disappointment keen when they failed to prosper with the rapidity of his own ardent desires. His mind was constituted broadly and generously, and easily leaped over, by the eagerness of anticipation, the inherent difficulties of similar enterprises, difficulties that only severe experience reveals and only time can remove.

He was the founder of the Catholic University of America, and the most precious documents in its "Chartularium" will always be those that emanated from him. His colossal statue graces its halls as an eternal memento of the hopes that he based upon the enterprise. It is well known that, as his pontificate wore on, he came more and more to believe that in the United States was to be looked for the freest and most generous development of Catholic Christianity. Correspondingly he was persuaded that our Catholic education should be crowned with a university suited to the needs of our religion and our fatherland. Almost at the hour of his death he was engaged in plans for its welfare, especially for the more active execution of the original plans approved by himself, after frequent and minute consultation with the representatives of the American hierarchy. May his spirit long live with us, and spur us to some completion of his holy ambition! Leo XIII will surely be put down among those popes who have deserved best of ecclesiastical learning. It is not too much to say that he did more than any of his predecessors to revive the ideals of a Benedict XIV. May we not hope that in the centuries to come this Alma Mater will always strive to be held worthy of its descent from such a noble lineage?

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

THE ETHICS OF THE LABOR UNION.

During the summer just past, we have seen many important events in the history of organized labor. Although no great strike has disturbed industrial life, yet countless minor troubles have caused inconvenience and have invited severe criticism. Manufacturing and building operations have been seriously interfered with, an element of great uncertainty has entered into all contract work undertaken under a time limit and into all business that requires stability among its factors. Evidences of fraud on the part of some representatives of labor have been discovered, strong threats by a few leaders have attracted the attention of the press, which has begun, in a certain way, a determined campaign against unionism. The courts in some localities have been liberal with the injunction, fervent in expressing bitter condemnation of the principles of unionism and in enunciating theories concerning inherent rights which they mistake for contingent rights. With all of this, the conviction that socialism is developing is wide-spread and there is a feeling that between unionism and socialism deep sympathy exists. As a result of the situation, public attention is slowly turning its piercing eye towards labor unions. The impression is one of condemnation. Now, no observant man can fail to realize that unionism is not to be destroyed; some principles as the unions declare them, will remain. The concessions of many employers as to the rights and functions of unions have great and favorable influence on their growth. Unionism in some form as a social factor will influence our future. It will lose in radicalism as it gains in power, but the change will come from within; not so much in the change of principle as in improvement of method, in the elevation of the character of its representative men, and in the gradual modification of our institutions. To-day, the world judges unionism by its representatives, its mistakes and its psychological limitations. It were wiser to judge it also by its necessity, its historical origin, its feeling and its logic. In the following pages an attempt is made to show the feeling and

the logic of the unions, without, however, working out a detailed comparison between them and the situation that they attack.

In making an effort to understand the ethics of the labor union as a theoretical system according to which the unions attempt to reconstruct industrial relations, it is necessary to guard against confusion in the points of view. When exposition is a writer's sole purpose, he is not called upon to approve or condemn, nor is he required to call attention to every concrete detail which may bear on the thought in question. This is the reader's task. At the same time, one must guard faithfully against such a presentation as of itself seems to carry an argument for or against the principles which are to be merely described. For that reason, it may be helpful to suggest a few general thoughts before undertaking the exposition of the ethical principles which labor unions teach.

In its conflict with capital, labor has placed itself squarely on an ethical basis. Its demands are inspired by the idea of justice and right, not by that of economic or social progress immediately. The unions have evolved a code of rights and obligations by which they desire to reconstruct industrial relations. They are in a position to govern themselves to a considerable extent by these principles, but they can not control the employer or force him to see as they do, except when he is content to deal with them. Granting union principles to be true, they connote only general corresponding obligations which may stand against society as a whole rather than against any particular individual.

The employer stands practically on a business basis. He is not ethically obliged to go into business. He studies a situation carefully, sees an opportunity for successful industry. He is free, he addresses himself to free laborers—as he thinks, and he enters into business relations with them with the thought of mutual interest. The employer studies, risks, arranges; his individuality appears in the business world; he is responsible for the quality of his product. The laborer's individuality does not appear. The employer was free, is free; the laborer was free, is free to work or not to work for him. It is a matter of business, free contract and

free understanding. Certain conditions of fact limit this freedom. The employer must pay wages that will attract men; otherwise they will desert him. He must pay living wages, or his men can not live. In addition, the general run of the factors of competitive industry will largely fix wages without much specific influence on the part of the employer. The union tries to lift industry to the ethical plane, while the employer holds it to the plane of business, free contract, voluntary association for mutual benefit. A complete study of the situation would require an analysis of the principles of the unions, the principles of the employers, and the assumptions of fact made by both. At present, the principles taught by the labor unions alone are exposed, with no other view than to assist the reader to understand the issue.

Striving is the law of all healthy life. Wherever we find it, be it in the tree, the tiger, the laborer or king, life strives. It is eager to develop, to preserve itself, to reach full proportions, to realize latent possibilities, and to resist decay. Hence we see growth everywhere; when growth has ceased, death has begun. The essential thought of life is perpetuation, increase, progress. This general truth of the physical order is paralleled in the mental, the moral, the spiritual, the psychological orders as well, provided no abnormal elements appear. Discontent with present achievement, eagerness for a greater, is universally found in normal man. The really learned man seeks more learning, the powerful seek new strength, the righteous seek greater justice. From schools and university chairs, and pulpits, from literature and the press, from leaders and teachers comes the one cry "Be eager, strive, grow. Contentment is death; discontent is divine." Ambition is merely energetic discontent; without it the world would scarcely move.

All of the social classes into which society is ordinarily divided reveal this same law normally. The rich seek more wealth, the learned seek more knowledge, the cultured seek more refinement. Class ideals dominate and support their members. Were any class to fail to show this striving, this ambition, it would be doomed. Generally, strong classes show it more than weak classes, for strength means abundant life

and weakness means low vitality. The social class wherein this eagerness, ambition, striving had till recently shown itself least, is the laboring class. It appeared comparatively late in the history of the modern laboring class because the class was socially weak. But where the consciousness of strength came, labor was awakened to hope, to ambition, to eager striving. This awakening, in itself the best promise of progress that society knows, to-day, has created the labor unions. They represent only a minority of the wage earners but it is a minority that is awake, eager, ambitious.

The laborer desires what all life demands plus what normal growing human beings want; more life, larger development, latent powers unfolded and opportunity guaranteed. The only absolute inalienable human right is that of development; a right prior to and more sacred than all property rights and institutional rights of human history. Consequently the enlightened laborer in aiming to enlarge the circle of life, demands that all secondary contingent rights which hinder him, yield to his basic right. This position of labor means that the laborer demands leisure, culture, more home life, higher enjoyment, all extending the margin of life out considerably beyond the narrow circle of physical existence and labor, and this at the expense of the property interests of the employer. This initial demand of labor, therefore, is not the work of demagogues; it is nature, history, life. Discontent cannot be eliminated from society. It represents a law higher than individuals, one which is permanent in its action and independent of every form of political and social institution. These last named give to this demand definiteness and measure but the law is absolute in life.

Coming now to see the form in which the fundamental eagerness and striving of labor expresses itself, we are brought directly into relation with social and political institutions and standards.

In present conditions, laborers possessing only labor power work for owners of capital. The former receive a share in the industrial product which is called wages. Ordinarily the wages received determine the possibility and opportunity which the laborer enjoys, of personal development, his opportunity of

education, moral, spiritual and social refinement, home life. This being a condition of institutions and fact, by which the laborer is confronted, he converts his general, natural, striving for fuller life, development, refinement, into a concrete definite demand for fair just wages. This demand rests on the idea of his dignity and rights as a man, or the law of nature which allows to him opportunity of reasonable development and imposes on society the moral duty of adjusting institutions so that this may be made possible. In addition, laborers believe that they vitalize capital, that they create the profits on which capital thrives; that labor is an integral factor in the industrial process and consequently that they ask only what is of their own creation in demanding fair just wages.

The next claim logically made by laborers is that the father of the family should earn this wage for his family; that the wife and mother should remain in the home and the children be at play or in the school. The integrity of the home, its sacredness against the inroads of industry is here defended. The protest is not against helpful, educating work for children, which is regulated to further their growth; this itself is education of the most practical kind. This right to a family wage for the father is not prominently maintained in the labor movement to-day, though it belongs to its logical system.

The laborer now assumes as a fact, that this fair wage cannot be secured by unaided individual effort in the present organization of society. He assumes that it can be secured by organization, and by that means alone. Hence he claims that unionism, the organization of labor into united bodies for concerted action is a right and duty. It is not specifically a formal natural right and duty; it is contingently so. The facts which make up the situation from which the laborer takes his inspiration are easily summarized.

Laborers must work in order to live. They must work for owners of capital. These latter are competitors among themselves, each seeking profit and power. Hence the tendency to reduce expenses to a minimum. Wages are held down, great risks to life and health are imposed upon laborers (as best seen in mining and on railroads), sanitation and safety appliances are neglected, hours of labor are lengthened. The employer

is immeasurably stronger than the individual laborer. Women and children are employed in competition with men. All of these conditions have been seen during the last century. The physical, moral, social, intellectual and religious development of the laboring class has actually suffered greatly because of these conditions. While this was the case, laborers were hearing much about democracy, equality, the rights of man, the function of government and its duty to protect the weak. The modern state busied itself with the political condition of its citizens but it did not concern itself with their industrial condition. When therefore the industrial and social condition of the laboring class became critical the state manifested no impulse to improve it. At the same time, the new industrial relations had grown away from traditional law, but having no actual statutes to fit, our courts have endeavored to stretch the old to fit the new. Thus neither State nor legislature nor courts quieted the fears of labor in the threatening development which confronted it. Religion could not aid it effectively, no matter how much its teaching showed sympathy for its wrongs. Schools and universities might teach in sympathy but such teaching made little headway against the currents of industry that were sweeping the race into their mad rush. Thus laborers internally led by nature, to striving and to ambition, encouraged by political teaching to believe in their human rights, taught the view of larger life; led to the knowledge of development which conditions denied to them, unaided by State or specific law, convinced that they had wrong to right, they were driven to the one result—to organize—to unite and ask gently or secure forcibly the consideration of their rights by modern society. Thus organization is looked upon as a duty by laborers; and as a natural right, as against those employers who deny or oppose the right of the union to exist and to act. From now on, in our study, the individual laborer disappears from view and the class, the union replaces him.

THE UNION AND ITS MEMBERS.

If the reader will hold in mind the thought already advanced, he will see in what follows only logical deductions, bold as they may appear. The union believes itself to be

necessary and ethically sanctioned. It claims consequently the power to govern the laborers in their work; to fix wages, hours, conditions of work for them. The individual is merged into the class and the class acts in and through the union. This is the distinctive note of the union. Consequently it aims at a monopoly of its trade and seeks to control the entire supply of labor in any given line. In present conditions, it has no sanction other than to fine or to expel a member. Thus the individual's total industrial liberty is given up to the union. In return the union aims to secure higher wages, better protection for life and limb, shorter hours and improved conditions of labor generally.

THE UNION AND THE EMPLOYER.

The union exists to coerce the employers into granting better conditions to labor; hence the two are in tendency antagonistic. The employer refuses to recognize a union, refuses to deal with its members, or he may refuse to employ union labor. As against him the union claims the right to exist, to act, to represent the laborers and to deal with him. Once recognized, the union claims the right to joint jurisdiction with the employer in conducting business. Conditions at present give the employer a monopoly of the authority and property of business; the former because of the latter. Labor and capital are coöperating factors, as such they are intrinsically related. Labor is as much an integral part of the industrial process as capital. It does not understand why all authority should be thrown to the capital partner and none to the labor partner. In the union's demand for joint jurisdiction, labors whole claim is really voiced. The determination of wages, hours and conditions is to be made concurrently by representatives of capital and labor. Logically, then the union claims the right to make demands for labor, to enforce these demands, if necessary by the strike; to protect the strike by hindering in any legitimate manner the non-unionist from replacing the striker and to withhold patronage from any employer who opposes organized labor.¹

¹Mr. Carroll D. Wright describes the nature of this joint jurisdiction in these words. "The union . . . insists that recognition means a trade agreement with it by which the union shall take part in fixing the conditions, and,

THE UNION AND THE NON-UNIONIST.

The members of the union are presumably the most advanced laborers. They are men who take in view the economic tendencies, who believe that they see peril to labor and to society and civilization in the unchecked power of capital. They believe that the laboring class must save itself; in so doing perform a noble work for humanity. As this can be done only by organization, it is the duty of laborers to unite—to enter the unions. The power of the union depends on its monopoly of labor, the laborer who refuses to join the union neutralizes its influence. Most of the energy, time and much of the funds of unions are expended on organization. Men are sent about the country to arouse the sentiment, to encourage organization and effect it. The claim that labor is a trust and merits denunciation misses an essential difference in that it is the trust of the weak against the trust of the strong as viewed by laborers themselves.

THE UNION AND LAW.

When as was once the case, the right of association was greatly restricted, unions had to win right of organization. To-day in the United States it is universally recognized. The unions do not incorporate—though this is allowed—because of the possibility of unlimited prosecution to which they might easily be subjected. The unions watch legislatures and generally support legislative committees whose purpose it is to promote labor legislation and hinder any that might be antagonistic to its interests. The unions further claim the right to represent labor before the courts whenever, as is the case with granting of injunctions, the interests of labor are threatened. The situation in theory may be resumed in a way something like the following:

to a certain extent, shall dictate the terms under which labor is employed." The employer's view is thus formulated in the principles held by the National Metal Trades Association. "We recognize that as the realization of mutual benefits represented in the profits and earning from our joint labors, depends largely on the employer finding a suitable market for the product, he can best determine the methods of work, the selection of employes and the character of the work to be performed by each." See *Bulletin* of the National Metal Trades Association, Oct., 1903. Only employers unfriendly to unions are kept in mind.

FUNDAMENTAL ASSUMPTIONS.

1. Natural forces themselves do not insure wages that are fair and just, the standard of justice being the laborer's human right to human development.

2. Laborers play the most important part in the production of wealth, hence they are actually factors in industry, with the rights of factors.

3. In present conditions the individual cannot secure fair wages.

4. Organization is the only means available, by which justice can be secured.

Guided by these assumptions, the following rights are claimed by laborers.

THE RIGHTS OF THE INDIVIDUAL.

To increasing human development, larger higher life.

To fair just wages—justice being measured by this higher right.

The father of the family shall normally earn this wage.

Individuals shall unite to secure it by organized action.

THE RIGHTS OF THE UNION.

In Regard to Members.

To govern and to represent them in their industrial relations.

In Regard to Employers.

1. Recognition by the employer.

2. As authorized representative of the labor partner in industry, the union has the right to joint jurisdiction with the employer. Hence,

3. The union may make demands for labor, enforce demands by strike, protect the strike by the use of peaceable means to hinder non-unionists from replacing strikers.

In Regard to Laborers Generally.

1. The union—in view of the assumptions made—has a right to a monopoly of the trade, the laborer having the correlative duty to join the union.

2. The union has the right to propogate unionism unhindered by law or employer or court.

In Regard to the State.

1. The union has the right to exist and to act.
2. To represent the interests of labor before legislatures and courts.

Analyzed, the movement shows the following elements in its spirit. The natural striving of humanity for betterment: the positive teaching of our political philosophy, extended to industrial relations; the neglect of legislatures, courts and the failure of religion and schools to protect labor effectively; the tyranny, inhumanity, injustice and arrogance of capital.

It will be seen at a glance that the whole situation of the unions reduces itself to the assumptions of fact above referred to. Once they are granted to be true, the logic of the further positions is certainly strong. But the task of proving those assumptions is extremely difficult. We can see readily that a dangerous social tendency has been checked by the unions and that they have undoubtedly worked great good. It is not difficult to believe that they are destined to work still greater good—in one or another form; but the actual concrete proof of the assumptions on which the code rests is by no means easy. Skill or lack of skill on the part of the laborer; economy or extravagance, industry or laziness, drink and many other aspects of individual life and action within the power of men to a large degree, are factors in fixing the lot of the laborer and determining his share in culture and happiness. If the laborers were individually faultless and unable to secure justice, it seems that the world would be with them in their demand for justice. While there is a large element of personal individual fault in them, they will have difficulty in proving to the unwilling world the truth of their assumptions. Those whose hearts are with the striving and hoping of laborers, are none the less their friends, when they express the hope that the unions will realize this—and aim to merit justice fully before they condemn the institutions under which we live.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

THE CHRISTIAN AGAPÉ.

The Agapé, the "Love Feast" of primitive Christian times, has recently been called "one of the obscurest problems, if not one of the eternal enigmas in the history of the Church." The statement was true when it was made, but there are signs that it shall be true no longer. The same writer who, in such strong terms, calls attention to the mystery enveloping the Agapé, has started, by his work, a controversy that promises to do away with the mystery.

In 1901, Mr. J. F. Keating, of Edinburgh, presented for the degree of doctor of divinity in Cambridge University, a dissertation entitled "The Agapé and the Eucharist."¹ His ambition in writing, he admits, was not to add largely to what was already known on the subject, "but to attempt to bring together such illustrative sources as are available in heathen and Jewish literature, to pass under review the various references or allusions to the Agapé in the New Testament and the Fathers and to compare the extant 'Ordinances' on the subject with one another."²

Whether or not, in thus marshalling the forces for the defense, he intended to provoke the attack of any lurking party of the opposition, such has been the consequence of his work. Mgr. Batiffol, rector of the Catholic University of Toulouse, has taken occasion of Dr. Keating's array of information, to make a general attack upon the traditional view of the Agapé. In the fourth of a series of studies in positive theology,³ he has controverted not alone the details of Dr. Keating's findings, but has made bold to deny *in toto* almost every conclusive statement of his opponent, to undermine every position taken by him, to question every reasoning urged by him, to contradict his every exegesis—in a word, to deny not only the liturgical character of the Agapé, its connection with the Holy Eucharist, but its very existence as an authorized and distinctive feature of early Christian life.

¹ London, Methuen, 1901.

² *Ibid.*, pp. v, vi.

³ "Etudes d'Histoire et de Théologie Positive," Paris, Lecoffre, 1902.

There the controversy began. It has not yet ended, but has already engaged the talents of some of the best archæologists of the day.⁴ And it is well that there be an exchange of opinion on this historico-liturgical question. It has been the misfortune of the Agapé to remain undebated. There has been until now a most surprising uniformity of opinion among the learned in this matter. Muratori and Bingham had spoken, and Augusti, Mamachi, Migne, Martigny, Smith, Kraus, Herzog, and even Hastings, were content with little more than variously worded reiterations of the dicta of the masters.

Their teaching on the Agapé has been substantially as follows: that the custom was a continuation of our Lord's habit of eating and drinking with His disciples, and especially—as most maintain—a conscious imitation of the quasi-sacred ritual of the Paschal supper: that the Agapé was, therefore, intimately associated with the celebration of the Blessed Eucharist, so intimately in fact, as to form the preparatory rite which led up to and culminated in the Sacrament and Sacrifice; that in origin it was strictly primitive; if it was not included in our Lord's memorable "Breaking of the Bread"⁵ with His disciples after His resurrection, it was at least the daily action of the Church of Jerusalem in the days immediately following the first preaching of St. Peter;⁶ that thenceforth, it enjoyed a morally continuous existence, and was, presumably, of universal observance; that,—naturally enough, though unfortunately,—this habit of taking food and drink in the assembly, led to serious abuses, and that, consequently, as early as the time of St. Paul's first Epistle to the Corinthians, it was necessary to reform the custom; that the abuses were corrected, and the Agapé took new life and continued down through the second, third and fourth centuries: that, however, as early as the beginning of the second century it ceased to serve its primary purpose—that of a preparation for the Eucharist—but it continued as an observance of quasi-liturgical character, taking place in the Church, being conducted by the

⁴ The first eminent scholar to take up Mgr. Batiffol's criticism is Dr. Funk of Tübingen. (*Revue d'Histoire Ecclésiastique*, January, 1903.)

⁵ St. Luke, 24, 30.

⁶ Acts, 2-42, 46, etc.

clergy and accompanied with prayers and blessings. Further, with the abundant influx of converts after the triumph of Christianity, the Agapé saw the beginning of its doom. It was made a substitute for the gross feastings to which the *neo-conversi* Gentiles had been accustomed, and it was not long before the sacred supper which had once enjoyed the distinction of being the companion-rite of the Holy Eucharist degenerated so seriously as to become intolerable. Its end, long postponed, was imperatively demanded; its death was decreed, and though it avoided a sudden extinction by adopting a number of adroit disguises and submitting to many reformations, it gradually yielded and disappeared, leaving only a trace, here and there, of its once universal vogue.

Such has been, from the time of Muratori, the coherent if not very clear and detailed story of the Agapé. Without hesitation, Mgr. Batiffol sweeps away this whole chapter with the clean new broom of modern historical criticism.

There is no trace of the alleged Agapé, he maintains, in any New Testament writing; not a vestige of genuine testimony to it in any of the Fathers of the first three centuries; or if there be perhaps a suggestion of it in one or two of their writings, it is only by way of condemnation of an unauthorized custom. Its first undoubted historical witness is in the "Church Ordinances," and here its features are outlined clearly enough to enable us to see that the so-called Agapé was nothing more than a means of almsgiving; it had no liturgical character. The traditional view, he declares, has been not only wrong but vitiated, for there are evidences of a doctrinal intent in this long-standing collusion for the maintenance of a teaching that has no historical foundation.

So much for the outlines of the controversy. Whatever its merits, it enables us to see that any future discussion must concern itself with two plain questions: *First*, is there sufficient historical evidence that the Agapé was in a true sense a *primitive* institution of the Christian religion, and second, was it, primitive or not primitive, a *liturgical* custom?⁷

As to the meaning of the word "primitive"; we may be

⁷ The dissertation, of which this essay is part, considered also the later Agapé; lack of space prevents our treating of it at length here.

permitted to use it loosely as indicating apostolic and sub-apostolic times, or the first and second centuries, for the dispute lies there.

Over the word "liturgical," we need have no quarrel. Its accepted specific meaning has been given by many liturgists, and perhaps most succinctly by Dr. Kraus.⁸ After giving the general and untechnical meanings of the word, he says: "According to the more accurate ecclesiastical usage, the 'liturgy' comprises only that group of prayers and actions in connection with which the Eucharistic sacrifice was offered." That this definition is substantially the one agreed upon by all the authorities, is evident;⁹ that it is acceptable even to those who demand most when they apply it to the Agapé, is shown by the fact that Mgr. Batiffol himself frequently uses it or its equivalent as a touchstone for determining the character of the Love-Feast.

Our two questions then, in terms a little more precise, are these: Did the Agapé exist in the first two centuries; and had it, either at that time or later, so close a connection with the Eucharist as to form part of the ceremonies which had their climax and culmination in the consecration of the Body and Blood of Christ?¹⁰

The answer to each of these questions, until the appearance

⁸ "Real Encyclopædie," s. v. *Liturgie*.

⁹ Cf. Probst, "Liturgie," p. 3; Suicer, "Thes. Eccl.," s. v.; Brightman, "Liturgies, Eastern and Western," I, p. 580.

¹⁰ By thus narrowing the investigation, I exclude a host of questions, interesting enough, but too lengthy for discussion here. Among others I may mention that of the possible origin and symbolic signification of the Agapé, whether, i. e., it was primarily a reminiscence of the Last Supper, or rather a reproduction of the ordinary Jewish ceremonial meal. The consensus of opinion—I may mention in passing—favors the former view. Muratori, Bingham, Meyer, Kraus, Corblet, Hastings, Probst and Brightman, may be named, at random, as holding to it. A notable dissenter is Mr. Keating, who is inclined to believe that the Agapé was a commemoration not so much of the Last Supper as a reminiscence of the ordinary "table-fellowship" which the apostles enjoyed with our Lord, and a symbol "of the central doctrine of Christianity, the doctrine of love, embodied in the word Agapé" (p. 40). He quotes Spitta ("Ur-Christenthum," I, p. 263) as repudiating the idea that the Agapé was a "Christian Passover," and giving two reasons for agreeing with this repudiation: first, "that no description of the Agapé shows a characteristic likeness to the Paschal Meal," and second, the frequent repetition of the act (p. 41). The Agapé, in all probability, was a daily custom, the Paschal Supper was celebrated only yearly, and "why," asks Dr. Keating, "was the Agapé celebrated so frequently if it were intimately associated with the Paschal Supper?"

of Mgr. Batiffol's two recent essays¹¹ on the subject has been given universally in the affirmative. "All the ancients," says Bingham,¹² "reckoned the Agapé an apostolical rite accompanying the Communion," and we may add that all the moderns have held a like view. Bingham himself agrees with "the ancients" whom he quotes. Muratori says: "The Agapæ were known and used every day by the apostles, in imitation of the Sacred Supper of Christ before His death, and were celebrated in connection with the Eucharist";¹³ Augusti declares that "this much is certain, that the Agapæ were a *truly liturgical institution*";¹⁴ Neander says, "the two together" (viz., Agapé and Eucharist), were called the Supper of the Lord (τὸ κυριακὸν δεῖπνον);¹⁵ Bishop Lightfoot maintains that "in St. Paul's time, the Eucharist was plainly a part of the Agapé"¹⁶ (he means of course no more than that the two were celebrated together); Dom Cabrol, summarizing the elements of the primitive Christian assembly says: "A fraternal banquet occupied the greater part of the evening or night, uniting the faithful in charity, prayers and psalms, and in conclusion came the celebration of the Eucharistic rite";¹⁷ Duchesne admits that the Agapé was liturgical in the primitive Church, though he claims that it ceased to be so "one hundred years after the first preaching of the gospel";¹⁸ Corblet says that the Christian Sacred Meal differed from its Jewish prototypes in this, that while the latter had "no religious liturgical character the Agapé was inspired at once by charity and by religious sentiment";¹⁹ and Dr. Armitage Robinson writes in Hastings' "Dictionary of the Bible" (art. Eucharist), that "in scripture there is no trace of the Eucharist being separated from the Agapé."

The latter reason seems to be quite away from the point. Presuming that the Agapé was a reproduction of the ceremonies of the Paschal Supper, it would doubtless follow, in frequency, the celebration of the Eucharist, itself a transmutation of a yearly feast into one that was daily.

¹¹ He first discussed the Agapé in Vacant's "Dictionnaire de Théologie" (Paris, 1900), s. v. Agapes, Fascicule II., pp. 551-555.

¹² "The Antiquities of the Christian Church," V, p. 476.

¹³ "Anecdota Græca, De Agapis Sublatis," p. 339.

¹⁴ "Antiquities," II, p. 704, "Eine eigentliche gottesdienstliche Einrichtung."

¹⁵ "History of the Church, etc.," p. 208, ff.

¹⁶ "Apost. Fathers," Part II, Vol. I, Ignat. ad Smyrn., ch. 8.

¹⁷ "Le Livre de la Prière Antique," Paris, 1902, p. 78.

¹⁸ "Les Origines du Culte Chrétien," Paris, 1902, 3d ed., p. 49.

¹⁹ "Histoire de l'Eucharistie" (Paris, 1885), vol. I, p. 584.

I need quote no more. These pronouncements are enough to indicate the unanimity of opinion.²⁰ Bingham, who had evidently read everything attainable, could find only one author who maintained that the Agapé and the Eucharist were not celebrated together, and he brands this opinion as "without any foundation and against the concurrent sense of both ancient and modern writers," and Mgr. Batiffol, the solitary exponent of the new view, admits that his conclusions on the Agapé are contradictory to those of "all the critics from Bingham to Renan."²¹

I. *The Agapé in the New Testament.*—To speak of "the history of the Agapé in the New Testament"²² is to indulge in a euphemism. The sum-total of texts, in the canonical writings, having even the remotest bearing on the subject, does not exceed a score. Of this possible score, fully one-half show nothing more than an antecedent probability of the existence of an Agapé; of the other half-score, all but perhaps three or four must be alleged only tentatively; of texts generally admitted as indubitable there are only two or three, and of these, one depends upon a disputed reading. Evidently this is slender testimony, and the scholar who is to utilize it in favor of the Agapé must support the actual reading of the Scripture with some reflex principle—so to speak—that will give color to his conclusions.

It is only honest to say that Dr. Keating, in his chapter on the Agapé in the New Testament does employ such a principle. He claims a proving power—perhaps better, merely a persuading power—for the texts he offers, only on the condition that they be "read in the light of subsequent practice, as shown, for instance by the early Fathers,"²³ and also when they are interpreted in connection with the known fact of the existence of sacred meals among the contemporary pagans and Jews. To pick away these two chief props of the structure that Dr. Keating has built with the materials of Scripture is to produce,

²⁰ I may add, however, the names of other consenting authorities. Suicer (s. v.); Zahn, "Ign. v. Antioch," p. 34; Achelis, "Canones Hippolyti," p. 202; Wilpert, "Fractio Panis," p. 16, n. Weizsäcker, "Apostolic Age," vol. II, p. 285.

²¹ Vacant, "Dict. de Théologie," Fascicule II, col. 556.

²² Keating, I. c., p. 36.

²³ Ibid., p. 36.

of course, a collapse. This is precisely what Mgr. Batiffol has done, and he has naturally made the Scripture argument seem, for the moment, ridiculous. It is scarcely necessary to insist on the injustice of such a proceeding. It will be more profitable to avoid it ourselves, and to allow, in our examination of the possible scriptural references to the Agapé, whatever additional worth they may borrow from both the prospect and the retrospect of history.

The New Testament evidences fall into three classes: First, those which merely show an antecedent likelihood of a Christian socio-religious meal; second, those which apparently bear witness to the existence of such a custom; and third, those which actually name the custom "Agapé."

The first class may be quickly disposed of. We are asked to note the significance of the fact that a great part of our Lord's parabolic teaching was illustrated by the image of a "supper," and that a symbolism based upon the customs of the table was constantly employed by Him; that He spoke of "eating and drinking at my table in my kingdom," of "eating the bread of the children of the kingdom," of supping with His followers in sign of friendship; and that not only in His verbal teachings, but in His example he made His people understand that there is a sacredness in the act of eating and drinking together, a symbolism which He would be glad to have them remember and observe when He was gone. He "broke bread" with His disciples, He multiplied loaves for the people in the desert, and, in short, He so often sat at table with those who were dear to Him, that the writer who particularly draws our attention to all these facts, feels justified in declaring that "our Lord's fellowship with His disciples was, to a large extent, a table-fellowship."²⁴

The significance of these allusions is obvious: it would be quite natural that the followers of Jesus, when once He was gone from among them, would be anxious to recall His presence, by an imitation of His habits, and principally by a continuation of the especially significant custom of eating together in token of fraternal affection. Add to this, that the most sacred of all the acts of our Saviour, the institution of the

²⁴ Keating, l. c., p. 37.

Blessed Eucharist, had been in connection with a symbolic meal, the Paschal Supper, and we may well think it inevitable that the apostles, when repeating the same awful act, would enshrine it in a ceremonial, imitative, as far as might be, of the Lord's own Last Supper.²⁵ Is the likelihood realized in the event?

The second group of Scripture texts seems to answer affirmatively, by making mention of an actually existing religious meal. The discussion centers about the phrase "the breaking of bread" (*ἡ κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*).²⁶ It is beyond dispute, however, that this formula is used throughout the writings of St. Luke—in his gospel and in the Acts—to designate primarily the Eucharist. It was in fact, from the beginning, and for the first two hundred years of the Christian Church, if not the only name, at least the usual name of the Blessed Sacrament.²⁷ Yet the defenders of the Agapé cite the passages in which the words occur as proofs undeniable of a "breaking of bread" other than the Eucharist, their contention being that the one formula includes both the sacramental and the non-sacramental rite. Mgr. Batiffol professes to find no reason for such an interpretation and though it is well-nigh the universal one, he rejects it as "arbitrary and subjective." Here, he would say, is the very fountain-head of the delusive tradition concerning the primitive Agapé, and he rejects at once all the alleged evidences of its existence.

The case may not be so summarily dismissed. The same scholars who demonstrate that the phrase in question designates the Eucharist, are quick to add that in all probability, it cannot be restricted to the Eucharist alone. They feel that the formula requires explanation, and they explain it on the hypothesis that the Eucharist was accompanied by a non-sacred "breaking of bread" which came in time to give its

²⁵ Mr. Keating, it will be remembered, thinks the Agapé was not a direct imitation of the Paschal Supper.

²⁶ Sec. Probst, "Liturgie," p. 26; Wilpert, "Fractio Panis," p. 16; Kraus, "Real Encyclopædie," s. v. "Eucharistie"; Suicer, "Thes. Theol.," s. v. *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, after giving his opinion that the "breaking of bread," is the original and peculiar designation of the Eucharist, cites for his support the Syriac version which, he says, translates "fractio panis," in Acts, 2, 42, by "fractio Eucharistiæ"; Blass, Comment. in loc. Acts, 2, 46, 20, 7-11; 27, 35, says "in omnibus his locis est sollemnis designatio cenæ Dominicæ."

²⁷ Acts, 2, 42; 2, 46; 20, 11; 27, 35.

name to the whole service. The ground for the hypothesis itself is the context in which the debated words are often found. In Acts 2, 46, for example, "breaking bread from house to house, they took their meat in gladness and simplicity of heart," the liturgical formula "breaking bread" is apparently in apposition with the ordinary terms, "taking meat," a merely physical meal. Led by the face meaning of the words, some of the commentators (even Catholics who are naturally anxious to find references to the Eucharist)²⁸ have concluded that in this place at least there is no mention of the Eucharist; that the "breaking of bread" here is used of the Agapé alone. But this interpretation is unusual and unnecessary. A more favorite explanation of the passage is that it shows only a close connection, not an identity, between the customs of "breaking bread" and "taking meat."²⁹

A somewhat clearer case is that of Acts 27, 35, the passage in which St. Paul is represented as encouraging his companions in shipwreck to break their long fast, "to take some food for their health's sake," after which exhortation he "takes bread," "gives thanks," "breaks it" and "eats," whereupon, "they also took some meat." All the circumstances of this action would point to a mere satisfying of hunger, yet the consecrated formula "he broke bread" is introduced into the passage, and the liturgical significance of the grouping of the phrases, "taking bread," "giving thanks," "breaking," and "eating," somewhat weakens the supposition that St. Paul's action was a non-religious one. Yet if we may doubt that, in this passage, there is an indication of a liturgical action, it is evidently beyond question that if there was such an action, it is in immediate connection with the taking of an ordinary meal; another possible evidence of the supposed Christian custom of combining the sacred and the non-sacred "breaking of bread."

The reading of the third verse in question, Acts, 2, 42 is a matter of dispute, and the argument for or against the Agapé

²⁸ e. g. McEvilly, in loc.

²⁹ The words "from house to house," are no argument against the Eucharist, because, as is well known, the exclusively Christian service, which took place before the Christians repaired in common with the Jews to the Temple, was held in their homes.

varies slightly with the reading. The Vulgate reads "in communicatione fractionis panis," which the Rheims translation renders literally "in the communication of the breaking of bread." The original Greek, however, inserts the conjunctive particle *καί* between *κοινωνία* the "communication," and *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, the "breaking of bread," thus differentiating the "communication" or the general "fellowship," which includes the common meal, the Agapé, from the actual "breaking of bread," the Eucharist.

Upon this latter reading Meyer constructs an ingenious analysis of the text in question. We may quote it and apply it, for determining, if possible, the character of the connection between the common meal and the Eucharist.

He says:³⁰ "Unless I mistake, St. Luke distinctly enumerates all the parts of the divine worship:

1. τῇ διδασκίᾳ τῶν ἀποστολῶν,
2. καὶ τῇ κοινωνίᾳ
3. καὶ τῇ κλάσει τοῦ ἄρτου,
4. καὶ ταῖς προσευχαῖς.

Such an analysis is natural and legitimate enough. It consists merely in grouping graphically parts which in the text are given continuously. But see the consequence. In virtue of this coördination of the elements of the Christian service, *ἡ κοινωνία* stands in the same class with *ἡ διδασκία* and with *αἱ προσευχαί* and these three together, grouped around the *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, the Eucharist, form the primitive liturgy of its celebration.

One of two alternative facts, then, is sufficiently manifest from an examination of these texts of the Acts. Either the formula "fractio panis" includes both a sacramental and a social breaking of bread, or, if it more correctly expresses only the sacramental action, it is yet placed in such close connection with other non-liturgical formulæ as to suggest a companionship of two customs, one a sacrament, the other a common or semi-religious meal. The fact is significant: the almost inevitable conclusion is that in the first Christian Church at Jerusalem there was an expressly intended union between the Holy Eucharist and the common meal which tradition has

³⁰ Comment. in Acts 2, 42.

called the Agapé. This much established, it is no far cry to the supposition that the infant Church continued the practice, which our Lord had established, of consecrating the sacred species at the close of the fraternal meal, making the meal serve as the preparatory ritual of the sacrament. And what is this but to say that, in the Acts of the Apostles, the Agapé is indeed a liturgical action?

Mgr. Batiffol's opinion, therefore, that in all the passages thus far brought forward, "the breaking of bread" means the Eucharist, and the Eucharist alone, though tenable by one who insists on the actual meaning of an isolated phrase of Scripture, is impossible to one who takes account of the context. The weakness of his view is indicated by the fact that he ignores entirely the significance of the constant juxtaposition of the two actions of eating an ordinary meal and of celebrating the Holy Sacrifice. The phenomenon is certainly worthy of note, yet Mgr. Batiffol quite disregards it.

A further weakness of his view is in its utter lack of the support of tradition or of authority. He seems to be in the distinguished but unenviable position of agreeing with nobody but himself.³¹

The center of the discussion over possible references to the Agapé in the New Testament is the eleventh chapter of St.

³¹ It ought to be noted here, not by way of controversy, but as a means of throwing light upon the general discussion, that within the space of a few sentences Mgr. Batiffol has made two important mistakes. He exaggerates the conclusions which Dr. Keating draws from the texts thus far quoted, and he misses a prominent point in his adversary's position concerning the relation of the Eucharist with the Agapé. After admitting that our Saviour's custom of "breaking bread" with His disciples would probably give rise to the practice of a common meal among the brethren, he asks: "But how can you conclude from this that the Eucharist and the Agapé are both included in the term *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*, and that the Agapé has its justification, basis and object in its intimate connection with the Lord's Supper. Yet Th. Harnack and Lightfoot do so reason . . . and Dr. Keating so reasons, after bringing together the texts wherein the *κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου* is mentioned . . . concluding that it is impossible to see in these texts only the Eucharist and not to include what was later known as the Agapé?" (p. 280). Now, the truth is, Dr. Keating does not say "it is impossible not to include the Agapé." He says rather, that, "taking all the passages where the expression (*κλάσις τοῦ ἄρτου*) occurs in the New Testament, while it would be impossible to restrict it *with certainty* to the Eucharist proper, it seems in this passage (i. e., in Acts, 2, 42) to include both" (l. c., p. 44).

Again, Mgr. Batiffol mistakes in saying that Dr. Keating agrees with Th. Harnack that the Agapé "has its justification, basis and object" in the Lord's Supper. Dr. Keating expresses his disagreement with that view (p. 39), and actually confronts it with two objections (p. 41).

Paul's First Epistle to the Corinthians. It will be best to quote the passage entire, since almost no word of it is insignificant.

"When you come together it is not now to eat the Lord's supper, for everyone taketh before his own supper to eat. And one, indeed, is hungry, and another is drunk. What! have you not houses to eat and drink in? Or despise ye the Church of God and put to shame them that have not? What shall I say to you? Do I praise you? In this I praise you not. For I have received of the Lord," etc. (here follows the classic account of the revelation vouchsafed him concerning the institution of the Blessed Eucharist). "Wherefore, brethren, when you come together to eat, wait for one another. If any man be hungry, let him eat at home that you come not together unto judgment. And the rest I will set in order when I come."

Here is a large bone of contention to throw between the protagonists and the antagonists of the Agapé. But we must be brief with it, for the bulk of our discussion is from extra-scriptural sources and we may not give this part more than its proper relative importance.

The questions are: Does St. Paul refer to an Agapé; and if so, was it held in connection with the Holy Eucharist; and does he condemn the practice or only legislate for its decorous observance?

Both opinions are maintained. The practice of assembling for a common meal is beyond doubt, after a reading of this passage, say those who favor the existence of the Agapé, but it gave rise to an abuse. There was selfishness and haste among those who could bring their own supper, and those who could not bring their own went hungry. Hence, a true Lord's supper became impossible, and St. Paul complains of the irregularity and disorder. As for the text, "have you not houses to eat and drink in? If any man is hungry let him eat at home," this may be read, and considering the context, *must* be read to mean simply that the Agapé was not to be a full meal, but a slight repast, not sufficient to satisfy hunger, but only enough to serve a symbolic purpose.

The opposite interpretation—that of opponents of the existence of the Agapé—declares that St. Paul, in the passage quoted, forbids any eating or drinking whatsoever, in the

Church; that he pleads not for decorum but for an actual abolition of the habit of taking food in connection with the Holy Sacrifice. "It would be impossible," urges Mgr. Batiffol, "to find a more decided condemnation of a religious repast."

To give our own summary: We may perhaps safely say that the passage seems at first to condemn anything like an Agapé. But there is a difficulty in the way of thus understanding St. Paul's words, for he seems to contradict himself; in one breath, apparently condemning the custom ("have you not houses to eat and drink in"), but in the next breath apparently tolerating it ("when you come together, wait for one another").

But condemnation or toleration aside, the fact remains that the Corinthians were in the habit of eating and drinking in the Church, and at the very meeting in which the Holy Eucharist was celebrated. The custom must have had an origin somewhere. What more natural than to see its origin in the common gatherings for the "breaking of bread," spoken of in the Acts of the Apostles? And if such had been its origin we may well believe that it was an authorized, apostolic, and therefore a quasi-sacred custom which St. Paul would have been slow to condemn.

And this, our expectation, seems to be realized. For St. Paul seems not to condemn it. If it was, in his judgment, worthy of rejection, his language of condemnation ought to be unequivocal. We have seen that it is not unequivocal. Hence the natural conclusion is that he tolerated the practice.

Again, on the supposition that the Apostle intended to abolish the custom, why should he, in this very context, remind his people of the manner of the institution of the Eucharist, recalling to their minds that our Lord consecrated bread and wine at the close of an actual supper? Would not this relation suggest to the minds of the Corinthians an argument in favor of retaining the supper in connection with the Eucharist, and does it not suggest to our minds that St. Paul uses the narration as a means of enforcing what he wished to say, namely that the meal in connection with the Consecration ought to be as decorous as was Christ's meal with His Apostles before

the first Consecration? This much seems certain, then, that St. Paul made an attempt not to abolish the custom but to regulate it.

May we now go further and say that the Agapé as it existed among the Corinthians, was in the true sense a liturgical practice? The question cannot be answered by an appeal to the text itself. Accordingly, the defenders of the Agapé have summoned for the support of their view, St. John Chrysostom's commentary on the passage. The appeal is unwise, for although one may, with some show of reason, extract from the original words of St. Paul an evidence of the connection between the Eucharist and the Agapé, the interpretation of St. Chrysostom tells positively against the connection of the two. It is strange that this fact should have been denied or overlooked, for the commentary is in no degree ambiguous:

"As in the case of the three thousand who believed in the beginning, all had eaten their meals in common, such also was the practice when the Apostles wrote—not exactly the same indeed—but to a certain extent the communion abiding among the first Christians descended also to those that came later. Since some remained rich while others were poor, they could not have placed all their good in common, but they prepared a common table on stated days, as was natural, and, *when the meeting was over, after communicating in the mysteries*, they all came together, for a common feast. But afterwards this custom fell into disuse."³²

Elsewhere St. John Chrysostom uses practically the same words:

"*After the communion of the mysteries*, they did not immediately return home . . . but the rich brought meat from their own houses, and called the poor, and made common banquets in the Church itself."³³

This description, as is plain, gives us absolutely no reason for supposing that the common meal had any liturgical significance. On the contrary, if we may trust Chrysostom as an interpreter of the apostolic custom, the table set for the poor

³² Chrysostom, Hom. 27, in I. Cor.

³³ Hom. 22.

by the rich was nothing more than a banquet of fraternal charity—not indeed a mere alms, since all, rich and poor, sat down together—but yet only a social meal taken after the service, before the people returned to their homes. It was, perhaps, a “love-feast,” a manifestation of Christian affection and of spiritual equality, but by no means one of the rites surrounding the Holy Eucharist.³⁴

Such is the natural deduction from the words of St. Chrysostom. It does not follow, however, that such was the historical truth. The great archbishop of Constantinople, in spite of all his skill in exegesis and all his familiarity with St. Paul, may yet be mistaken in a point of fact. His opinion, that in St. Paul’s time the Agapé was an accidental appendage, not an organic part of the Eucharistic service, is rejected by almost all the modern commentators.

Bishop Lightfoot, for instance takes 1 Cor. as an absolutely certain witness of the union of the Lord’s Supper and the Love-Feast. “In St. Paul’s time,” he says, “the Euchar-

³⁴Dr. Keating assumes from these two descriptions that Chrysostom is “giving us a perhaps somewhat idealized picture of the Agapé of his own time,” and that he “makes it clear that in his day, and for some time previously, the Agapé had been held in the Church. Such a deduction is scarcely warranted. Chrysostom is speaking in the way of narrative, describing a custom of which his hearers apparently knew nothing, what was to them already an antiquity, a thing obsolete. This is manifest from the whole sense of the passages. What wonder then that Dr. Keating, in this matter, lays himself open to the cavil of his keen-eyed critic, Mgr. Batiffol.

But the critic himself, in turn is open to criticism. Answering Dr. Keating, he says that Chrysostom is speaking of a custom of apostolic days, not of his own times. Why, then, does not Mgr. Batiffol acknowledge this fact when he is himself treating of what he calls the “alleged” Agapé of the early Church? Why not do something towards explaining how Chrysostom could be wrong in understanding St. Paul? Mgr. Batiffol is willing enough to use the testimony of the great student of the apostle when it will refute an adversary, but he neglects it entirely when it places a difficulty in his own way. This is surely a defect in Mgr. Batiffol’s method. He sets himself in direct opposition to all the recognized interpreters of the Holy Scriptures, yet never deigns to explain how they could, one and all, have gone so far astray as to start the tradition concerning an Agapé.

But—to drop the discussion—if we care for a true description of the Agapé of St. John Chrysostom’s own time, we may consult his forty-seventh homily on Justin the Martyr. He says to his people:

“Wouldst thou participate in a bodily table (as well as a spiritual one)? Then it is lawful, after the breaking up of the assembly to take one’s ease under a vine or fig-tree near the monument of the martyr, and to allow the body relaxation.” This passage is quoted by Dr. Keating himself (pp. 148–149), yet he seems not to be conscious that it contradicts both his statements: “Chrysostom” (in the other essentially different description) “is giving us a somewhat idealized picture of the Agapé of his own time, and in his day the Agapé was held in the Church” (p. 145).

ist was plainly part of the Agapé (1 Cor. 11). The Christian festival both in the hour of the day and in the arrangement of the meal was substantially a representation of Christ's meal with His Apostles. Hence it was called the Lord's Supper, the name originally applied to the combination of the Eucharist and the Agapé.⁷³⁵

Now, it is just such confident and sweeping assertion as this which kindles the indignation of critics like Mgr. Batiffol, who demand that the statements be either ruled out or substantiated by an appeal to the letter of the text. As a matter of fact, it requires more than the letter of the text to justify a deduction such as that of Bishop Lightfoot. He comes to his conclusion, not merely by a reference to the actual verbal construction of the passage, but by bringing to the reading a sense of the value of suggestions, moral proofs, *a priori* judgments, elements of exegesis, legitimate enough, in spite of the fact that they irritate those who find it to their advantage, in any particular instance, to clamor for a literal rendition of the words of a text.

The traditional interpretation, then arrives at its conclusions by some such method as this: starting with the fact that St. Paul tolerated a common meal in the assembly ("when you come together to eat, wait for one another"), and proceeding on the assurance that this meal was to serve rather a symbolic than a practical purpose ("If any man be hungry, let him eat at home"), we may see that the apostle is reproving his people chiefly because by too much eating and drinking, they profane the Body and Blood of Christ, making themselves unfit to receive it in Holy Communion. There must, then, have been a close connection between the two features of the service, the Eucharist and the Agapé.

Furthermore, in this relation of the two, the Agapé must have come first, else how could the excesses attached to it directly unfit one for the Holy Communion? Again, to repeat what has already been hinted at, St. Paul's concern is to teach the Corinthians how they may worthily celebrate the Sacred Mystery, and he proposes to teach them by reminding them of the institution of the Blessed Sacrament. He therefore

⁷³⁵ "Apostolic Fathers," part II, Vol. I, p. 400.

recites to them the story of what took place "in the same night in which our Lord was betrayed." On that hallowed occasion, be it noted—the supper came first; afterwards "*postquam cœnavit*," came the Consecration. This is the model St. Paul proposes to the Corinthians, and he gives us no reason for denying that he intended they should follow it in detail.

And, finally, what reason could the Agapé have for being in such close proximity with the Eucharist, unless it was part of the ritual? It could not have been a merely social meal, else it would not have been held at the same time and in the same connection with the Eucharist; it could not have been an ordinary meal for it was not intended to be sufficient to satisfy hunger. What, then, remains but that it was a liturgical meal, a part of the preparation for the Sacrifice of the Body and Blood of the Lord?

Hence, the conclusion: the Agapé probably held the same position relative to the Eucharist, in the Church of Corinth, which it had in the cenacle and in the "Hauskirchen" at Jerusalem. This is all that the traditional exegesis of I Cor. wishes to maintain, but this means that the Agapé was a liturgical rite.

There remain for consideration the two texts of the New Testament, which are generally considered as expressly naming the Agapé: Jude 12, and 2 Peter, 2, 13. In effect the two passages are only one; for either Jude copies from 2 Peter, or 2 Peter copies from Jude.³⁶

The texts read: Jude 12, "There are spots in their banquets (*ἀγάπαις*) feasting together without fear," and 2 Peter, 2, 13, ". . . stains and spots, sporting themselves, rioting in their feasts" (*ἀγάπαις*), or "in their deceivings" (*ἀπατάς*). The fruitlessness of contending over these passages is shown from a comparison of the contrary conclusions reached by our two contending exegetes. It matters not, says Mgr. Batiffol,

³⁶ There has been no end of discussion concerning the dates of these epistles and their relative age. Bacon ("Introd. to the N. T.") gives for Jude A. D. 85-90, 2 Peter A. D. 100-150, and says (p. 170) there can be no doubt that this is the right order, notwithstanding the genius of Spitta who thought otherwise." But, on the other hand, Dr. Bigg in the volume "St. Peter and St. Jude," in the "International Critical Commentary" gives many reasons for reversing the order, aiming to show that Jude copied from 2 Peter. Among the more conservative, though not less able critics, Belser ("Einleitung") gives the dates, Jude A. D. 66, 2 Peter A. D. 67.

whether you admit ἀγάπας instead of ἀπάταις,³⁷ in either of these texts or in both, for the difficulty remains that the word ἀγάπας does not necessarily mean "feasts," on the contrary it must mean merely love, "dilectio," "caritas," as elsewhere in St. Jude.

And, it matters not, says Dr. Keating in turn, whether the reading be ἀγάπας or ἀπάταις, "in any case, the allusion to the love-feasts is undoubted!"

This rather amusing contradiction gives us the key to the situation; neither here nor in any other passage adducible from the Sacred Scriptures is there sufficient information to enable the scholar to conclude with strict certainty on the existence or the character of the Agapé. Whether one sees in the text thus far considered a proof or a denial of the Agapé depends, in large measure, upon one's previous attitude of mind, and one's previous attitude must be produced by something more convincing than the evidences in the New Testament writings.

II. *The Agapé in the Second Century.*—The crucial texts on the Agapé are those taken from second-century documents. They are not many: altogether, strong, doubtful and weak, they may be easily enumerated: "The Didaché," ch. 10; "St. Clement to the Corinthians," ch. 44; "St. Ignatius to the Smyrnæans," ch. 8; "Pliny's Letter to Trajan" X., 97; "The Epistle to Diognetus," ch. 5; "The Octavius of Minucius Felix," ch. 31; several passages in "Tertullian: The Acts of Paul and Thecla," ch. 25; the "Passion of St. Perpetua," ch. 17; and "Lucian, de Morte Peregrini," ch. 12.

This is the sum of all the texts of sub-apostolic writings which can have any claim to contain an allusion to the Agapé. And yet of this number more than half are useless as controversial weapons. Any scholar consciously urging a defense of the Agapé would do well to throw out of this list of second-century testimonies all but those of Ignatius, Pliny, and Tertullian, for the rest are only so much *impedimenta* in the battle against hostile criticism.

³⁷ This is the disputed reading. The Codex Alexandrinus and the Codex Ephræmi give the reading ἀπάταις in 2 Pet. 2, 13, which, however, is probably as Bishop Lightfoot maintains, "an obvious error" ("Apostolic Fathers," Ignatius, II, 312).

Evidently, this fact—that out of a period well stocked with Christian evidences, only three texts for the Love-Feast can be found fit to stand a rigid examination—speaks eloquently for the opponents of the Agapé. And this is not their only advantage; they must be given the credit of another significant fact, the silence of two of the most important Christian writers of the century under consideration, Justin Martyr, and Irenæus. It is not the purpose of this essay to disregard or to obscure any such notable indications as these: Let it be plainly stated, then, that the critics who oppose the theory of the early existence of the Agapé may accredit their cause with these two points: the paucity of second century documents, and the silence of the two writers who ought, perhaps, to have especially mentioned it—the apologist Justin, and the controversialist Irenæus. The *argumentum e silentio* is especially strong in the case of St. Justin, because although he gives *ex professo* a full and distinct description of the main features of Christian liturgical practice, apparently concealing nothing, hampered by no *disciplina arcani* (for his first Apology, and especially that chapter of it which describes the Eucharist, is one of the main proofs that the “Discipline of the Secret” was not yet in force in his time, or that it did not affect the frankness of an Apology addressed to the Imperial Court) and having therefore an adequate, indeed an imperative, reason for naming and explaining the Agapé, yet gives not so much as a hint of its existence.

Such, unless I mistake, is a fair statement of the case *against* the Agapé in the second century. I shall not attempt directly to weaken any part of the argument it suggests, except by mentioning, in the proper place, a possible explanation of the silence of Justin.

The immediate discussion centers on the few texts I have named as defensible evidences of the Agapé.

The first is “Ignatius to the Smyrnæans,” ch. 8, a short chapter, but one that for general doctrinal purposes has been called the most important in all the seven Ignatian Epistles. The argument demands that we have it, in its entirety, before our eyes:

“Avoid divisions as the beginning of evil. Follow, all of you, the bishop, as Jesus Christ followed the Father, and follow the presbytery as the apostles. Moreover, reverence the deacons as the Commandment of God. Let no man do aught pertaining to the Church, apart from the bishop. Let that Eucharist be considered valid, which is made under the bishop, or him to whom he commits it. Wheresoever the bishop is, there let the people appear, even as wheresoever Christ Jesus is, there is the Catholic Church. *It is not lawful apart from the bishop, either to baptize or to hold a Love-Feast.* But whatsoever he approves, that also is well-pleasing to God, that everything you may do may be secure and valid.”³⁸

The usual comment on this passage is that the word *ἀγάπη* here translated “Love-Feast” includes both the Eucharist and the Agapé proper, and this very text is used as a proof that the two parts of the service were so intimately associated in the time of Ignatius (c. A. D. 112) as to permit of their being named in one and the same word. But the reasons given for this opinion are rather unsatisfactory; the truth being that the commentators find some perplexity in the grouping of the phrases of the text.

Lightfoot, for instance, simply says that, “In such a connexion the omission of the Eucharist is *inconceivable*. The Eucharist *must* be contained implicitly in the Agapé,” and Mr. Srawley, an editor of Ignatius, who generally follows Lightfoot, continues the thought: “Otherwise it would be difficult to see the importance of the mention of the Agapé here or to explain the omission of the Eucharist, if it is not included in the phrase.”³⁹

The perplexity of the commentators is the opportunity of their critics. Mgr. Batiffol asks not, “why must we include the Eucharist,” but “why attempt to include the Agapé?” It is not necessary to do so, he maintains; in fact, it is not possible to do so, except by reading into this second-century text a meaning of the word *ἀγάπη* which it did not have until the fourth century. The plain solution, he continues, is that the Eucharist and the Eucharist alone is mentioned here,

³⁸ I give the version of Rev. J. H. Srawley (“Early Church Classics,” Ignatius), who follows, except in some details, Bishop Lightfoot’s text and interpretation.

³⁹ L. c., II, p. 43.

the whole context giving us to understand that ἀγάπη is used as a synonym, in the abstract sense "love," for the Eucharist.⁴⁰

I can see reason neither for Bishop Lightfoot's perplexity nor for Mgr. Batiffol's solution of it. An analysis of the passage is the shortest way out of the difficulty, if there be a difficulty.

St. Ignatius is expressly inculcating not the discipline of the Eucharistic service or of any other practice exclusively, but a general obedience to the bishop in "all things pertaining to the Church." "Let no man," he says, "do aught apart from the bishop"; without him there must be *first*, no Eucharist, *second*, no assembly, *third*, no baptism, *fourth*, no love-feast, etc. The Eucharist, then, though it is not mentioned in the very sentence with the Agapé, is *not* omitted from the passage. It is mentioned in its place, *i. e.*, *first*, among the rites which require the presence of the bishop. How can Bishop Lightfoot maintain *a priori*, that it *must* be mentioned again in the word ἀγάπη, or that its omission in that precise word is "inconceivable"? He cannot without entering a vicious circle, argue that in Ignatius the Agapé and the Eucharist are inseparable, for the chief proof of that possible fact is the passage in question. He can only insist that to place the Agapé, if it be a separate institution, in such close juxtaposition to the Eucharist and to Baptism, is to concede too much importance to it. But supposing for the moment that the Agapé, without being strictly a Eucharistic rite, had the quasi-sacred character which attached to it later, say in the Canons of Hippolytus; in such a case it would have been of sufficient importance to demand—as it did in the latter text—the presence of the bishop, and consequently would have been not unworthy to be named side by side with other features which require the episcopal supervision.

This supposition, even though it may not be the true solution, is at least possible, and so sufficient to break the theory of the necessity of the inclusion of the Eucharist in the word ἀγάπη.

But on the other hand, though we need not agree with Bishop Lightfoot that the "Agapé *must* include the Euchar-

⁴⁰ L. c., p. 287.

ist," neither need we agree with Mgr. Batiffol that the Agapé as such is not mentioned at all. The context leads us to conclude differently. The mention of the Eucharist, in the first place, by its own name *εὐχαριστία* would naturally suggest that *ἀγάπη*, a line or two later, must be something different. What necessity is there for a repetition of the prescription concerning the Eucharist? St. Ignatius has already said, "Let there be no *Eucharist* apart from the bishop," why go on to say, "Let there be no *Agapé* apart from the bishop," if *Eucharist* in the one sentence and *Agapé*, in the other, are identically the same? The plain conclusion, then, from a straightforward reading of the text, is that both the Eucharist and the Agapé are mentioned separately in the text. If the Agapé includes the Eucharist, the fact must be proved otherwise than by the wording of this passage.

But Mgr. Batiffol insists upon the fact that the word *ἀγάπη* is to be found twenty-eight times in the Epistles of St. Ignatius, in its abstract sense of "love" a synonym for "caritas," "dilectio," etc., and hence, he would have us believe, that in this passage it "designates nothing particular in the concrete," such as an Agapé, but is used by a sort of metonymy for the Eucharist. It is hard to see the significance of such an argument as this. If Mgr. Batiffol could bring forward a passage or two in which Ignatius undoubtedly uses *ἀγάπη* for the Eucharist, and declare that it must be so used here, we could understand the argument. But as far as we know *ἀγάπη* is never once used interchangeably for the Eucharist. And why, then, call attention to the fact that Ignatius uses the word when he means "love"? What other word could he use? Granted that the word is ordinarily an abstract noun, it is evidently used here in a concrete sense, else the phrase *ἀγάπην ποιεῖν* is unintelligible.⁴¹ The only question is whether the concrete thing it expresses shall be Agapé or Eucharist, and this question leaves us at the same point from which we started.⁴²

⁴¹ *ἀγάπην ποιεῖν* the reading of the Short Recension: *δοχὴν ἐπιτελεῖν* of the Long Recension.

⁴² The word *ἀγάπη* is the ordinary term for "love" in the New Testament and the Fathers. Suicer ("Thesaurus," s. v.) quotes abundantly from the Fathers to show that the word was used to denote "love," human and divine, *i. e.*, love of God

Agapé then, it may be concluded, is, in this passage of Ignatius, a thing in itself, distinct from the Holy Eucharist. But our usual second question suggests itself. Is there any evidence that the Agapé was liturgical in the Church of Smyrna? The answer to the question may be sought in a further examination into the reasons which have induced such good authorities as Lightfoot, already quoted, and with him Funk and Probst, to maintain that the phrase ἀγάπην ποιεῖν must include the celebration of the Eucharist.

Lightfoot and Funk simply state their opinion, resting it on *a priori* reasons, but Dr. Probst endeavors to prove it by the use of an accumulative argument of no little force. He notices, first, that the word ἀγάπᾱ has been used a few lines before, in its ordinary sense, indeed, of "to love" but in the midst of an exhortation to use the Holy Eucharist; hence a subtle hint that there was a connection between the word and the Sacrament. Second, he points out, that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν is used in the same construction with the sacramental action βαπτίζειν; hence a possibility that ἀγάπην ποιεῖν is itself sacramental. Third, he calls attention to the fact that the word ποιεῖν is, in Justin Martyr and elsewhere a sacrificial word occurring in the phrase εὐχαριστίαν ποιεῖν; hence a probability of its being here an indication of the sacrificial act. Fourth, Ignatius prescribes that no one shall perform this action "apart from the bishop"; hence, a presumption that it was a sacred function.⁴³

Now, it is just possible that this reasoning oversteps the mark—proves too much. We can imagine Mgr. Batiffol thanking Dr. Probst for the exposition and affixing to it his

towards man, and love of man for God; likewise for "charity" in the broader sense of "kindness," "good-will," "favor," etc. In short, wherever we use the word "charity" or "love," the first word at the tip of the pen or the tongue of a New Testament or patristic writer was ἀγάπη. The immortal praise of "charity," in I. Cor. 13, is praise of ἀγάπη.

The word, of course, is not classic in the noun form, but the verbs, both ἀγαπᾶω and ἀγαπᾷω and the adjective ἀγαπητός, etc., are found frequently in the classics. ἀγάπη, the noun, occurs first in the Septuagint (cf. Liddell and Scott), and from that time, as long as Greek was used in the West, it was the ordinary and standard word for "love."

All the Greek lexicographers, notably Suicer, who discusses the word at great length, agree that the plural form ἀγάπαι, designates primarily, and perhaps exclusively, the Christian love-feasts. In the face of such facts it seems folly to attempt to prove that ἀγάπη in the text of Ignatius means "Eucharist."

⁴³ Probst, "Liturgie," p. 64.

own conclusion: "Therefore ἀγάπην ποιεῖν means to celebrate the Holy Eucharist." This is more than Dr. Probst will allow, but, to be honest, anyone might naturally draw the same conclusion from his argument.

To avoid this conclusion which seems otherwise unwarranted, we may, perhaps, best maintain the position we have already chosen, as most defensible, viz., that while there is not sufficient reason for asserting that the Eucharist is actually contained in the precise word ἀγάπη, there is, nevertheless, here in Ignatius, as in the Acts and in St. Paul, a significant collocation of the actions of celebrating the Eucharist and of holding the Agapé, an indication of a close union between them. If we may carry forward the conclusion arrived at from our examination of the New Testament writings, we may, with sufficient security, declare that in all probability in the year 112, the date of the Epistle to the Smyrnæans, the Love-Feast still remained what it had been in the year 54, a liturgical part of the Divine Service. Giving full allowance for the importance which Ignatius attaches to the Agapé, placing it side by side with the Eucharist and with Baptism, we must think it a sacred action, and if it were so, we can scarcely conceive that it was made sacred in any other way save by its organic unity with the Blessed Sacrament.

The second important testimony concerning the Agapé in sub-apostolic times is the famous letter of Pliny to Trajan.⁴⁴ This classic source of a thousand controversies contains a text that is of vital importance for or against the Agapé. According to the statement of the Christians apprehended by Pliny and obliged to confess their customs, there were two Christian meetings, one in the morning (*stato die ante lucem*), the other later in the day, undoubtedly in the evening. At the morning meeting, according to Pliny's understanding of the information given to him, a hymn was sung to Christ, and an oath was taken by the members of the community to abstain from all manner of evil deeds; at the second meeting the Christians assembled to partake of a common meal (*cibum promiscuum et innoxium*). Was this the Agapé? All the commentators and historians have thought so, but as usual Mgr.

⁴⁴ Ad. Traj., n. 97.

Batiffol rejects the traditional explanation. Why? Because, he says, unless this *cibum innoxium*, taken at the evening meal, means the Eucharist, Pliny's informers make no mention of the Eucharist whatsoever. But being apostates, they had no reason for concealing anything; they must mention the Eucharist. Furthermore—*odisse quem læseris*—the natural the Eucharist, not the Agapé.

We cannot accept this reasoning. For if the informers were, as Mgr. Batiffol says, in will and in intention apostates, then not only had they no reason for concealing the doctrine of the Blessed Eucharist but they had every reason for making it known in plain words. Apostates like to justify their defection before their own consciences and before the world, and what better justification could there have been in this case, than a blunt statement of a doctrine which would immediately appeal to their Roman judge as absurd and impossible, the doctrine of the Body and Blood of Christ in the Holy Eucharist. Furthermore—*odisse quem læseris*—the natural antipathy of apostates for their former brethren would lead them to divulge what they knew to be the dearest secret of those whose company they had deserted. Why, then, should these informers, if genuine apostates, carefully veil the most striking doctrine of the Church, its most intimate and best beloved secret, as well as its most apparently impossible mystery, the abiding presence of the very Jesus Christ who had been slain by the Roman power which was now working itself out in the hands of Pliny and Trajan? Instead of following the natural course and exposing Christianity, these apostates, Mgr. Batiffol would have us believe, skilfully shield the faith they have abandoned, by the use of an equivocal description of the Holy Eucharist, *cibum promiscuum et innoxium*. The hypothesis of apostasy and the hypothesis of a delicate concern for the sacredness of the Christian mystery, do not fit well together.

The more probable theory is that these informers were not intentional apostates, but only weak-kneed brethren—*lapsi* or *sacrificati*, as they would have been called in after days—who had sacrificed under fear of torture, but had still some sense of Christian fidelity to conscience. Under this supposition

their conduct is perfectly intelligible. Just as in the later persecution of Diocletian, when the demand was made upon the Christians to surrender their "magical" books, they gave over, instead of the Scriptures, writings of minor importance, keeping what was really sacred, so now these informers, still Christian at heart, tell the governor about the less essential of their religious practices, the prayers, the hymns, the "oath,"⁴⁵ the common meal, *cibum promiscuum et innoxium*, but they conceal under silence the awful and unmentionable truth of the Holy Eucharist.

A confirmation of the likelihood of this latter interpretation is to be found in a close scrutiny of the text itself, "The Christians," says Pliny, "declared that they had desisted from this custom after the publication of my edict by which, according to your commands, I forbade the meeting of any assemblies." What is the "custom" of which the governor speaks? Judging from the construction of the Latin sentence, he means the custom last mentioned, namely, that of "eating a harmless meal in common." The text runs, "*. . . morem rursus coeundi ad capiendum cibum promiscuum tamen et innoxium, quod ipsum facere desisse post edictum meum.*" Apparently, "*quod ipsum*" refers immediately to "*ad capiendum cibum*," which cannot consequently, mean "partake of the Eucharist," since it is inconceivable that the Christians should abandon the very essential act of their religion. Professor Ramsay⁴⁶ adds the support of his learning to this explanation by a reference to the Roman Law in regard to societies. "The Roman government," he says, "expressly allowed to all peoples the right of meeting for purely religious purposes." The morning meetings of the Christians were religious and Pliny obviously accepts them as strictly (*i. e.*, in the strict sense of the term) legal. The evening meeting was social, it included a common meal, and therefore constituted the Christ-

⁴⁵ This word "oath," "sacramentum," has naturally been an object of discussion. In view of the aversion of the Christians to taking an "oath," it may seem possible that the word "sacramentum" already had its later meaning, and that therefore it means the Eucharist, though Pliny could not understand it in any other than a judicial sense "oath." However, it is improbable that the Christian word "sacramentum" is of so early an origin. Tertullian, transcribing the passage, paraphrases *sacramento se obstringere*, adds *ad confæderandam disciplinam*. Apolog. C. 2. In any case our argument concerning the meaning of *cibum promiscuum* is not invalidated.

⁴⁶ The Church in the Roman Empire," p. 219, f. f.

ian community a *sodalitas*, an illicit assembly. The Christians abandoned the illegal meeting but continued the legal one.⁴⁷

"This fact is one of the utmost consequence. It shows that the Christian communities were quite alive to the necessity of acting according to the law and of using the forms of the law to screen themselves, as far as was consistent with their principles."

This opinion of Mr. Ramsay, if accepted, must prove that the words of the text of Pliny refer very plainly to a common meal, an Agapé, and not to the Eucharist.⁴⁸

"The question whether any meeting of the Christians could have been "in the strict sense of the term legal" has been vigorously debated. Professor Ramsay maintains, with the usual authority of his erudition, that "there was no express law or formal edict against the Christians in particular, nor were they prosecuted for contravening any formal law of a wider character interpreted as applying to them." The prosecutions under this theory were instigated by popular sentiment, and carried out in virtue of an established principle that the Christians were outlaws, *utterly beyond* the scope of positive legal enactments. Mgr. Duchesne appears to corroborate Professor Ramsay's view in a recent article in the "Miscellanea di Storia Ecclesiastica," etc. (Rome, November, 1902), holding that it is hardly possible to consider the emperors of the first two centuries as veritable persecutors. The true persecutor in these times was the pagan public. In the third and fourth centuries, the case was different, special edicts being issued," etc.

On the other side of the controversy the most considerable figure is M. Paul Allard ("Histoire des Persécutions," p. 64, ff., and p. 160), who declares it his conviction that actual edicts, making the Christians nominally and effectively an illicit association, were issued in the times of Nero and Domitian. Nero, according to Sulpitius Severus ("Chron.," II, 41), had decreed in terse phrasing characteristic of the Roman Law "*Non licet esse vos.*" Domitian added the charge, whether or not it was embodied in an edict "*propter atheismum et mores Judaicos.*" Tertullian (Apol. 4, 5) argues throughout as if he knew of written existing laws against the Christians, and to his testimony may be added the less weighty, but not less decisive words of Melito of Sardis (Eusebius, H. E., IV, 26), of the author of "de Mortibus Persecutorum" and Orosius ("Adv. Pag. Hist.," 7, 5).

The controversy, then, is a serious one, not to be settled off hand in a note. For our practical purpose we may say that whatever the issue, whether it be determined that the Christians under Trajan were or were not in a strictly legal position, the explanation I have given of their conduct in Bithynia under Pliny, is reasonable. If there were particular laws against them, it would be well for them to give up such of their meetings as would make them an illegal society, in order to be able to show themselves in all thing law-abiding, as far as possible, that is, in matters where the law of the state did not come in conflict with the higher law of God. That the Christians did so conduct themselves was the favorite contention of all the apologists. If, on the other hand, there were no law against them as Christians, they would again do well to escape the law against *sodalicia*, in order to be able to prove that persecution against them had no legal warrant.

In both hypotheses it would seem very probable that the meeting abandoned by the Christians in consequence of the edict of Trajan against "*Sodalicia*," was such a meeting as brought them under the edict—namely a social meeting *ad capiendum cibum*, in effect an Agapé.

⁴⁸ This opinion, however, though we believe it can be demonstrated true, is debatable; but strangely enough, Mgr. Batiffol, who for the moment has turned from Dr. Keating and crossed swords with Professor Ramsay, chooses for his

From the discussion, then, of the text of Pliny we may conclude that the probable facts are these: Because of the pressure of the law against societies enacted by the emperor and actively enforced by his governor, the Christians abandoned one of their two meetings. The meeting abandoned could not have been the Eucharistic one, yet it was one in which they took their *cibum promiscuum et innoxium*. This common food, then, was not the Eucharist. There is no reason for denying the traditional belief that it was the Agapé. Therefore an Agapé had probably been in existence in Bithynia previous to the time of Pliny's letter to Trajan.

But was this Agapé connected with the Eucharist? Probably not. We have seen that there were two meetings. The social gathering was held in the evening; its feature was the partaking of food in common. The other meeting was held in the morning; its feature, in the words of the governor, was *sacramento se obstringere*. It has been pointed out by Lightfoot and others that since the Christians were undoubtedly opposed to the taking of an oath of any kind, the word *sacramentum*, naturally misunderstood by the Roman lawyer, may have already obtained its technical meaning of "the mystery," and so may, in Pliny, indicate the Holy Eucharist.

Tertullian uses the word *sacramentum eucharistiæ*, and speaks of its being celebrated "*in antelucanis cætibus*."⁴⁹ Now, the words of Pliny informants are strikingly similar. They met *ante lucem* and a *sacramentum* was the purpose of their meeting.

If this surmise is correct; if the *sacramentum* was indeed the Eucharist, and the *cibum promiscuum*, on the other hand, was the Agapé, we have come to a conclusion of no little significance—that in one of the provinces, in the first years of the second century, the Love-Feast had ceased to have its liturgical character. It does not follow, of course, that the separ-

point of attack the least vulnerable point in his adversary's reasoning, the very sound and documentarily defensible statement that strictly religious associations were not under the ban with mere *sodalicia*. The very assembling for religious service, he maintains, was enough to constitute the Christian a *sodalitas*, and therefore the morning meeting, as well as that of the evening, was illegal ("Etudes," etc., p. 290). It would be interesting to know by what process of thought Mgr. Batiffol escapes the plainly contradictory clause of the *Lex Julia* "*religionis causa coire non prohibentur*."

⁴⁹ "De Corona Militis," c. 3.

ation took place thus early all over the empire;⁵⁰ still, the fact arrived at is of essential importance in our investigation, and deserving of more than passing remark. I shall return to it again in concluding the discussion of the texts of the second century.

And now naturally we are led to the promised suggestion concerning the silence of Justin Martyr, a suggestion that is a corollary to the thesis of the separation of the Eucharist from the Agapé in the time of Pliny.

If the law against *sodalitia* was so strictly enforced by Trajan in the provinces, it was, we may suppose, enforced also at Rome. Hence, in all probability, the Agapé was abandoned *in urbe* as well as *in orbe* somewhere in the vicinity of the year 112. It is conceivable, then, that Justin, born in the year 100, knew little or nothing about it by personal experience, and whatever he may have known of it by tradition, he would hardly mention in a petition for tolerance of the Christian worship. It was enough for him to defend what had to be defended, without adding to his task the burden of an apology for a custom already abandoned and not essential. Hence, he ignores the Agapé. There are evidences, however, that it was suffering, in the time of Justin, only a temporary obscurity. Its end had not yet come.

The critical text for or against the second-century Agapé and, indeed, for or against the Agapé in any century, is found in the thirty-ninth chapter of the Apologeticus of Tertullian. Dr. Kraus,⁵¹ summarizing all the passages of Christian and pagan literature of the first four centuries, which refer to the Agapé selects only six as *loci classici*. Of these six, four are taken from the writings of Tertullian, and the most important of the four is undoubtedly the one I have named. Hence, it is conservative to say that the fate of this text, under criticism, must go far to determine whether the story of the Agapé be fact or fable.

Mgr. Batiffol, coming to this discussion, begins with a retraction. He had, he confesses, considered Tertullian as an

⁵⁰ At Alexandria, e. g. (to name the extreme exception) the union seems to have lasted centuries longer (Socrates, H. E., v., 22).

⁵¹ "Real Encyclopædie," s. v. *Agapé*.

unobjectionable witness of the existence of the Agapé,⁵² but a more careful study has convinced him that Tertullian really "says not a word about the Agapé."⁵³

Assuredly, there ought to be a powerful reason for such a complete *volte-face* as this. What is Mgr. Batiffol's reason? Evidently it is not external authority, for here, as elsewhere, he stands in most conspicuous isolation. "All the critics," as he says, "have seen—and all except him do still see—an undeniable evidence of the Agapé in Tertullian. It is natural then, that we should expect some exceptionally luminous criticism, some particularly cogent argumentation in Mgr. Batiffol's discussion of the passage before us. Let us see if our expectations shall be realized.

This famous thirty-ninth chapter of the *Apologeticus*—it will be remembered—is alternately a glowing description of Christian manners and virtues, and a withering excoriation of the contrasted pagan customs and vices. The pagans, on their own acknowledgment, are without affection, without fraternal charity, but the Christians "love one another," care for one another; they have a common treasure, the provision of the spontaneous generosity of the brethren. This "deposit fund of piety" is used for the relief of the poor and the shipwrecked, for those that are exiled to the mines, for widows and orphans, and in general, for all such as are in need of charity. "One thing the moneys are not used for," says Tertullian—and there is a savage irony in his allusion—"they are not spent on feasts, drinking-bouts and eating-houses."

Now notice here, says Mgr. Batiffol, the common fund of the Christian community is not spent on eating and drinking. Yes, we do notice the statement, but we notice too, with surprise, the insinuation in the interpretation. Mgr. Batiffol will have us suppose that this passing fling from the "perfervid African" is a downright denial that any Christian money was spent in providing common feasts. We shall remember this assertion and refer to it. Tertullian continues: "So true and so practical is brotherly love in the Christian society that the faithful hold all their goods in common. There is com-

⁵² "Dic. de Théologie," s. v. *Agapé*.

⁵³ "Etudes," etc., p. 291.

munity of property among the brethren, just as—and here he is himself again—there is community of wives among the pagans.” And finally, coming to the matter which is of present interest to us—the indignant apologist exclaims: “You abuse our humble feasts; every pagan club can wallow in its gluttony; the Megarans feast as if they were to die to-morrow, . . . the Salii cannot feast without running into debt,” to reckon the cost of the public sacrificial banquets would require the skill of an expert accountant; the official celebration of the mysteries calls for the most skilful chefs obtainable, the kitchens wherein is prepared the banquet of Serapis vomit forth enough smoke to bring out the fire-department; all this is not alone tolerated, but encouraged; while the modest supper-room of the Christians is the cause of great commotion and indignation among the Romans. And now that they may know what goes on in that modest supper-room. Tertullian proceeds to describe the Christian custom exactly.

“Our feast explains itself by its name. The Greeks call it *Agapé* *i. e.*, affection. Whatever it costs our outlay in the name of piety is gain, since with the good things of the feast we benefit the needy. If the object of our feast be good, in the light of that consider its further regulations. As it is an act of religious service, it permits no vileness or immodesty. The participants before reclining taste first of prayer to God. As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger; as much is drunk as benefits the chaste. They say it is enough who remember that even during the night they have to worship God. . . . After washing of hands and the bringing in of lights, each is asked to stand forth and sing, as he can, a hymn to God, either one from the Holy Scriptures or one of his own composing—a proof of the measure of our drinking. As the feast commenced with prayer, so with prayer it is closed. We go from it, not like troops of mischief-makers, nor gangs of vagabonds, nor to break out into licentious acts, but to have as much care of our chastity as if we had been at a school of virtue rather than at a banquet.”

I have quoted this entire passage, because the narrative itself is clearer than any transcript that could be made of it. It requires no particular zealous partisan to see that these sentences are as irrefragable a testimony to the existence of the *Agapé* as could be constructed. Even Mgr. Batiffol, who,

when he wrote his article "Agapes" in the "Dictionnaire de Théologie," was anxious to bring its origin down as late as possible, was compelled to confess that here in Tertullian was what he called the first historical evidence of the practice of the Love-Feast. But now after "*une étude plus attentive*," of the text quoted, he draws the astounding conclusion: "Such is Tertullian's description, which we consider to be a description of the Eucharist and not of the Agapé." If any lesser authority than Mgr. Batiffol stood sponsor for such an opinion, we might say: "Your conclusion is evidently at fault, the passage stands for itself." But he is among the first of our critics and he is in his own field of historical criticism. He once shared the opinion of the ordinary reader, yes and of "all the critics" and he declares that only as the result of more searching investigation has he changed his mind. Not courtesy, then, but duty demands that we attempt, at least, to follow along the path of his argument.

His first reason is a sweeping one—a trifle *a priori*, to be sure, but not less conclusive on that account. This apparent feast cannot be the Agapé, he says, it must be the Eucharist. Why? Because the apologist *must* speak as Justin Martyr does, of the Eucharist. But unless Tertullian speaks of it here, he speaks of it nowhere in the Apologeticus. Therefore, he speaks of it here! Was there ever so bold an application of *a priori* reasoning!

Everyone knows that this kind of argument is an exceedingly delicate weapon of controversy. If handled at all, it must be used with great dexterity, and even then, it can be of advantage only when an opponent is unarmed with any instrument of defence. But to fare forth into the field of criticism with the slender equipment of a mere *a priori* dictum and hope to overcome an adversary armed with an historical testimony as plain and as broad as words can make it, such as we have seen in the passage quoted, this is to invite defeat.

Yet this is Mgr. Batiffol's venture, and this his preliminary argument. We know he counts it his first argument, because he says he will go on to a second. This second is, if possible, more unsatisfactory than the first. Tertullian, he says, is answering the charge of the pagans—"Your feasts are infam-

ously wicked." Now the wickedness the pagans alluded to was infanticide, and the charge of infanticide grew out of a gross misunderstanding of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Therefore, the supper which Tertullian describes is the one the pagans misunderstood, the Holy Eucharist. So Mgr. Batiffol.

It is difficult to imagine what may be the function of the ordinary manuals of historical criticism when a master of the art runs riot in this manner. If we could grant that Tertullian is defending his brethren against the charge of infanticide alone, and if we could forget the positive statements in his description of the Christian feast, there might be some show of plausibility in Mgr. Batiffol's contention. But we can do neither the one nor the other. The fact is, the apologist has already, in his seventh chapter, dwelt at length on the accusations of infanticide and incest. Here, in the thirty-ninth chapter he is concerned principally with the accusation of extravagance. He contrasts the luxury of the Megarans and the Salii with the frugality of the Christians, and explains that there is no extravagant outlay of money for the humble repast of the community. Mgr. Batiffol should have had a more plausible foundation for his *a priori* argument.

But to proceed; the charge of crime (be it of one kind or another) is brought forth. Tertullian is ready with his answer. Not the truest and strongest answer which would be a description of the Holy Eucharist;—no, not this, says Mgr. Batiffol, for this would be unintelligible to his pagan readers, but his answer is an appeal to the name of the feast "Agapé," which means "love." Surely a feast bearing such a name could not be made an occasion of infamy: this is proof conclusive. Can Mgr. Batiffol really be so unacquainted with Tertullian—Tertullian always exuberant with argument, always abounding with proof upon proof, Tertullian overwhelming with the riches of his logic and with the flow of his reasons? How could such as he be content with an appeal to a mere word in defence against the accusation of hideous crime!

"Tertullian," continues Mgr. Batiffol, "says not another word about the nature of the feasts (an unintelligible state-

ment in view of what is to come, but these are the *ipsissima verba* of the critic),⁵⁴ but the word he uses is the same which St. Ignatius applied to the Eucharist." Now, we can hardly recall that this was the conclusion of our exegesis of St. Ignatius; what we do remember is that this is the word Mgr. Batiffol claims Ignatius gave to the Eucharist, but that a contrary opinion was as strong as his. And here again we are face to face with a fundamental principle of criticism. In the discussion of the passage from Ignatius, Mgr. Batiffol complained that those who translate ἀγάπη by "Love-Feast," in the eighth chapter of Smyrnæans, are in reality reading into the word a meaning it did not have until the fourth century. But now Mgr. Batiffol's adversaries might retort that he persistently refuses to read into the word found in a text of the end of the second century any other meaning than one it may probably have had in the very first years of the century. He says: "If we are to translate ἀγάπη by 'Love-Feast,' we must have no precedent against such a translation in the Epistles of St. Ignatius." Can this be a valid principle of interpretation? May not a word change its meaning in a hundred years? Besides, precedent or no precedent, there is a strong independent reason for reading "Love-Feast" here; namely, the clear description Tertullian gives of the "eating and drinking," of reclining, etc.; a description which must, to put the case as mildly as possible, be taken in a non-natural sense in order to make it mean anything but a literal meal. In the face of this description and of the declaration that the feast described is called ἀγάπη any precedent usage of the word argues but feebly, if at all, against the present translation.

On two points, then, this reasoning of Mgr. Batiffol is unsatisfactory. He would have us accept the very lame theory that Tertullian repels the charge of vice in connection with the Christian *cænula* by an appeal merely to the name of the supper—an almost palpable impossibility when we reflect that we are dealing with Tertullian—and, secondly, he asks us to believe that because one very debatable reading extracts "Eucharist" from ἀγάπη in St. Ignatius, the word, whenever it occurs in Tertullian, *must* mean Eucharist, the possible

⁵⁴ L. c., pp. 294-5.

precedent in Ignatius having determined the meaning once for all.

But now we are come to the heart of the matter, the beginning of the actual description—for Tertullian does give a detailed description in spite of Mgr. Batiffol's declaration that "he says nothing of the nature of the feast."

"Whatever it costs the outlay in the name of piety is gain, for with the good things of the feast we feed the needy."

Evidently, it was hasty in our critic to say that the one thing certain about the little fund of the Christian community is that it was not spent for eating and drinking. There is "cost," and "outlay," and the result is "good things of the feast."

"The participants, before reclining, taste first of prayer to God." "So," says Mgr. Batiffol, "some one will say there was a reclining, and therefore, a feast. But no, this word 'reclining' is symbolic! Just as the words '*cænula*,' '*triclinium*' and '*convivium*,' elsewhere in Tertullian are symbolic, so here '*discumbitur*,' 'reclining,' is symbolic."

Shall we dare accuse the *savant* of so puerile a fault as *petitio principii*? Who says "*cænula*" "*triclinium*," "*convivium*" are symbolic? Only Mgr. Batiffol. And who says "*discumbitur*" is symbolic? Again, only Mgr. Batiffol. And why is "*discumbitur*" symbolic? Because "*cænula*," etc., are symbolic.

"As much is eaten as satisfies the cravings of hunger: as much is drunk as benefits the chaste."

The language does look more and more like a description of a substantial meal, but no, it is all symbolic, says the critic, and he summons his erudition—summons it too, from afar—to support his theory. The description of Abercius, he informs us, speaks of a mystical Bread and Wine which is Christ; so here the faithful eat and drink mystically. They "recline at a table," "satisfy the cravings of hunger," "drink moderately," but we are asked to believe that all this is done *in spiritu* and not *in veritate* because the inscription of Abercius speaks of a mystical Bread and Wine which is Christ.

"At the close of the meal, each one is asked to stand forth and sing, as he can, a hymn to Christ—a proof of the measure of our drinking,"

"which means," says Mgr. Batiffol, "that they hardly drank at all." True, if he will have it so, but Tertullian does not say so; rather they drank "as much as befits the chaste."

It was an ungracious task a moment ago, to convict a veteran critic of neglect of one of the rudimentary principles of his art, and we must be loth even to suspect that so capable a scholar can make the mistakes of a novice; none the less it must be recorded that he has, if not mistranslated, yet strangely manipulated the closing text of the passage. Tertullian says:

"Hæc coitio Christianorum merito sane illicita, si illicitis par merito damnanda si non dissimilis dammandis."

Now, the natural translation of these words is: "This assembly of the Christians is illicit if it is like (other) illicit assemblies; it is to be condemned if it is not unlike (other) assemblies that are to be condemned." that is "*hæc coitio*" is the subject of "*est illicita et damnanda*." The reader will pardon this elementary information when I say that Mgr. Batiffol translates "*Hæc coitio Christianorum*," this is the assembly of the Christians," and proceeds to construct an argument from his translation, "*this*," *this alone*, and no other is the Christian assembly. "What," he asks himself, "no other assembly;" and he likewise answers himself, "None," for Tertullian says "*this* is the assembly of the Christians." Therefore since there is no other which might be the Eucharistic one, this is the Eucharistic one, and "any indea of an Agapé is out of the question."⁵⁵

Surely, this is swift logic and extraordinary, but it is painful to remember that the whole argument rests upon so small a thing as a punctuation mark, and that the punctuation mark is of Mgr. Batiffol's own insertion. Drop the colon which he places (and he alone) after "*Christianorum*," and the argument falls to the ground.

One more statement invites comment; he makes it at the beginning of his consideration of Tertullian, but its value may

⁵⁵ L. c., p. 297.

be better seen now. "In this chapter," he says,⁵⁶ "Tertullian describing the different Christian reunions" (he has just said, by the way, that there was only one reunion), "mentions as the exercises of these reunions, prayer, reading of the Scriptures and the administration of censures . . . but he says nothing at all about a common repast." But we ask with all patience, how can Tertullian speak of a common repast, if when he talks of reclining at table, of eating and drinking, of suppers, and banquets, you deny that all this means a repast? In what words would Mgr. Batiffol have his author describe a supper if not in these words; supposing Tertullian wanted to describe a feast, how could he be more explicit than he is?

But, perhaps, I have delayed too long on faults of reasoning that are only too evident. Tertullian is clearly a witness of the Agapé and nothing proves it better than the violence of the attempt we have seen to distort his testimony. The fact that Mgr. Batiffol is dominated by his thesis is patent. He has manipulated words and sentences arbitrarily, he has suggested unnatural and improbable explanations of statements that needed no explanation, he has most strangely violated elementary principles of criticism, he has misused his erudition, and, what is worse than all this, he proceeds to impute motives to those who do not agree with him.

He says, p. 299: "Mr. Keating is evidently one of those dogmatists who are disposed to think that texts never prove anything against theses!" But the end and the outcome of the argument of the leading opponent of the Agapé is to settle our conviction that Tertullian is an undeniable witness to its existence.⁵⁷

As to the character of the Agapé in Tertullian, there can be little doubt. There is no evidence whatsoever that the feast detailed in *Apologeticus* 39, had any connection with Eucharist. On the contrary there is explicit statement of the fact that it was given primarily to help the poor and needy. It was not in any sense Eucharistic.

⁵⁶ L. c., 292.

⁵⁷ There are several other passages in Tertullian, which bear on the Agapé, viz., "Ad Martyras," c. 156; "de Baptismo," c. 9; "de Jejuniis," c. 17 (these three with *Apolog.* c. 39 are the "loci-classici" of Kraus); "ad Uxorem," ii, 5; "ad Nationes," 7; "de Corona Militis," 3 (these three are rather irrelevant though quoted by Dr. Keating).

Thus is completed the examination of the texts we have named as important among the documents of the second century Agapé. Two deductions, it seems, may be given as the result.

First: There are evidences, strong and convincing, of the existence in the second century of a Christian common meal, and that in the early part of the century this meal had a peculiar sacred character; that it was, in fact, the liturgical Agapé.

Second: This very tangible evidence may be used retroactively, so to speak, in support of the less evident evidences of the first century. It is no violation, but rather an application, of sound critical principles to use the certain knowledge yielded by sub-apostolic documents for the elucidation of uncertain passages in the New Testament. One need not, by claiming this, lay oneself open to the charge of "reading a second-century meaning into a first-century text." Not at all, for this could only be if the first-century text had a certain and demonstrable meaning of its own, contradictory to that of the later text. In the case in hand, the earlier documents have no such inviolable certainty of meaning. They are, to say the most—or the least—dubious; they may be read in either of two ways, and therefore the interpreter of them may legitimately assist himself by a reference to and a comparison with the more evident meaning of the later texts.

The question of the liturgical character of the Agapé in the second century, is a little more complex. Outside the canonical writings there are few, almost none, that contribute accurately to our information on this point. It is admitted by all, that as far as we may judge from written documents, the Eucharist was separated from its primitive setting, in many parts of the Church, long before the end of the second century. Starting with this acknowledged truth, we may, by a process of elimination push back the date of their disunion until we come to a point not many decades removed from the time of the Holy Scriptures themselves. Tertullian, describing the Agapé as it was conducted in the latter half of the second century gives us, as we have seen, no reason for thinking that it was part of the ritual of the Eucharist. On the contrary, he inclines us to believe, if we compare the passage already dis-

cussed with the passage "*De Corona Militis*," c. 3,⁵⁸ that the two were held at opposite extremities of the day.

Justin Martyr, describing the Eucharist, as it was celebrated fifty years before Tertullian, makes no mention of an Agapé as its accompaniment. Already, then, we are in the first half of the second century; how much further back must we go to find the Agapé occupying its primary position of honor? Mgr. Duchesne gives his opinion that the Eucharistic Agapé had ceased as early as "one hundred years after the first preaching of the Gospel," and there is no means of gainsaying his statement. Hence, we are come from the first half into the first quarter of the second century. And here we read some definite information, the letter of Pliny to Trajan, written in the year 112, which, as I have suggested, is the important document for the determination of the time when the Agapé had ceased to be liturgical. Its testimony is, not only that the separation had taken place in the year 112, but that some time previous to that date the Christians had ceased to observe the common meal.

Farther back than Pliny's letter we cannot go, for no earlier text yields any sure information relevant to the question of the character of the Agapé.⁵⁹

From the extra-canonical writings, we have but a niggardly amount of data from which to argue to the existence of a Eucharistic Agapé. So insignificant, indeed, is the information on this point, and so reluctantly is it yielded to the exegete that anyone having at heart the thesis that Agapé was indeed liturgical after the time of St. Paul, must be often worried for proofs. Suffice it for us, having no particular thesis, but being concerned only with the fact, to state the evidence, such as it is and let it determine its own worth as historical evidence.

III. *Conclusion*.—The net results of our short research into the existence and character of the primitive Agapé, may be set down briefly thus:

⁵⁸ "*Eucharistiæ sacramentum etiam antelucanis cœtibus sumimus.*"

⁵⁹ I think this is true, in spite of the opinion of Lightfoot and Zahn, that of the Eucharistic Agapé there are indications in early documents besides Ignatius, especially in the *Didaché*. Dr. Bigg, in his edition of "The Teaching of the Apostles," denies that the *Didaché* contains any certain mention, not to say a description, of the Agapé. An examination of the texts usually cited—10, 1; 11, 9; 16, 2; and 14, 1—confirms his opinion rather than that of Lightfoot or of Zahn.

The Agapé remains a phenomenon surrounded by not a little mystery. Much of the traditional information so confidently asserted in manuals and even in special treatises, is supported by very meagre documentary evidence. Not only are the sources usually alleged few, at the best, but perhaps a majority of them cannot stand scrutiny. Scholars who hold to the theory that the Agapé was the primitive rite of the Holy Eucharist, and therefore, a prominent feature of early Christian worship, are confounded with an insoluble problem: Why is there so little mention of this rite in the Christian documents of the first two centuries? Out of a score of the so-called evidences of the second century, not more than three or four are satisfactory, and the greater part of those rejected are so patently inapplicable that one can only be astonished to know that they were ever brought forth in testimony.

Farther, even among what we reckon the valid texts of the second century, all save one—Tertullian's *Apologeticus*—are vague and dubious; they need not a little exegesis and some application of comparative criticism before they yield available information. The texts of the Sacred Scripture—they are few—need the support of one another and of the later testimonies, if they are to prove that the Agapé was of a liturgical character.

This is one way of presenting the difficulty. Another way is to mention the writers who might reasonably be expected to mention the Agapé and yet ignore it: the *Didaché*, Clement of Rome to the Corinthians, The Epistle to Diognetus, Justin Martyr, Tatian, Athenagoras, all the apologists in fact, except Tertullian. Ignatius, Pliny and Tertullian are the only writers who give explicit or positive witness to its existence. Let it be understood, of course, that this number of those who ought to speak and are silent is not so summarily thrown out of court by the *ex-professo* counsellors for the defence of the Agapé; many of them are summoned as valuable witnesses, but I think, whether wisely or unwisely, that they have little or nothing of value to offer.

Now the question remains: Can the tradition of the existence of a primitive liturgical Agapé be deemed valid when so many writers ignore it, and when the few who speak of it—with

an exception or two—use equivocal language? I think the answer must be in the affirmative. For though I appreciate the difficulty of the proof, and do not, with Mgr. Batiffol,⁶⁰ declare there is no puzzle in the matter save for those who choose to make one, still I feel that sufficient reasons have been indicated, in spite of the many *lacunæ* of evidence, to encourage and support a conviction that the Agapé existed in the primitive days of Christianity and that it was primarily a part of the Eucharistic service. These two points were the main object of our discussion. We found them both denied, we have reached an opinion that the denial is unwarranted.

As to the means of arriving at the conclusion, the general rules of interpretation which I have endeavored to follow have been insinuated in passing. Suffice it to say, by way of résumé, that I have been unable to accept the stringent canons of criticism implicitly laid down by Mgr. Batiffol. I have thought that, provided there be some actual documentary witness and a considerable tradition for the existence of an alleged fact, we must not insist too rigorously upon having positive and full demonstration of its historicity, especially if we are dealing with an institution of such remote antiquity. A thousand difficulties need not make a doubt. Tradition, rational hypothesis and historical imagination go far to fill up the gaps in the written and monumental evidences.

The rigid criticism exercised by Mgr. Batiffol, has not been without its provocation in the placidity with which many writers have accepted conclusions on the Agapé simply because they are traditional. But we fear the eminent critic, in his indignation, has wielded the weapons of his warfare recklessly and has succeeded only in wounding himself and his own thesis.

Moreover, I imagine there is a trace of *animus* discoverable in his effort. He seems to be nettled by a fear of the unorthodoxy of the old opinion. His final words have in them something of the bitter savor of controversy: "Perhaps the Protestants have affirmed (the traditional view of the Agapé as the rite of the Eucharist) gladly, seeing in it a fact capable of weakening the Catholic conception of the mass, and Catholics,

⁶⁰ L. c., p. 279.

not suspecting this aspect of the question, have just as confidently accepted the traditional view."

We must confess that we are still among the unsuspecting Catholics who can see in the Agapé even though it be part of the primitive ritual of the Eucharist, no danger for our conception of the Holy Sacrifice. During the whole investigation we have met with no suggestion, worthy of notice, that the idea of the Mass can be in the remotest way affected by the character of the Agapé. As for the possible bias of Protestant scholars, it is noticeable they have generally been at pains to explain that the Eucharist and the Agapé are essentially different institutions. Dr. Keating, whom Mgr. Batiffol singles out as his especial opponent, is especially explicit in this matter. Though he laments a little over the fate of the Agapé, he says (p. 152): "But after all, it was the Eucharist and not the Agapé that was of divine institution, and so it was the Eucharist, the institution of Him who 'knew what was in man,' and not the Agapé, which man had, with the best intentions, added to the Eucharist, that survived." True it is, that not all scholars have seen this essential distinction so clearly. Corblet complains⁶¹ that not only some erudite Protestants, but Visconti himself ("De Ritibus Missæ," I., 2) confounded the religious ceremony of the Agapé with the sacrifice of the Mass." But these have been the exceptions to the rule; their opinions have had no weight; all modern critics, Protestant and rationalist as well as Catholic, generally agree that the Eucharist was always distinct from the Agapé, even though the two were not always separated.

There seems, then, to be no need of fearing for the Catholic idea of the Mass, because of any researches that have been made into the question of the Love-Feast. The polemical element need not enter the field; it is a matter for the investigation of those who are concerned purely with the history of the liturgy, and when all is said that may be said on the Agapé, the conclusion will be given in the words of the Ordinances of the Egyptian Church "It is blessed bread, but not a sacrament, like the Body of the Lord."

⁶¹ "Histoire de l'Eucharistie," II., p. 581.

IV. *The Later Agapé.*—It will be impossible to prolong this paper sufficiently to follow the Agapé through the third and fourth centuries, but a word may be said of this later Agapé merely by way of summarizing conclusions, not of proving them.

The real enigma in the history of the Agapé comes in the third century. Though we might naturally expect, from what we have seen, that in that period there would be a development and an expansion of the custom, all such expectations prove delusive. The third century writers who may be cited by even the most eager partisan of the Agapé are only three, Clement of Alexandria, Origen and Cyprian. Of these Clement has no commendatory reference to a Christian Agapé, but in two or three places⁶² he vigorously denounces what may have been either a relic of the early liturgical Agapé or a survival of a pagan religious feast. As for Origen and Cyprian they say so little, and say that little so obscurely, that they prove nothing.

Hence, after examining the passages carefully, I find myself changing masters, going over in allegiance to Mgr. Batiffol, who derides any attempt to show an Agapé in these writers of the third century. This change of base may seem strange, but it is the only possible move for one who examines the texts with no disconcerting thesis or prejudice.

True, there is some room for discussion over the passages in the "Pædagogus" of Clement, but the best defence of the Agapé that can possibly be urged from the writings of the great Alexandrine is that he reluctantly tolerates the practice of a religious meal, but reprobates the habit of calling it an Agapé.

There is only one passage in all the voluminous writings of Origen,⁶³ that can be alleged as a bare reference to the Agapé, and that one passage is scarcely relevant. At least it shows nothing definite. Cyprian is even a poorer witness than either Clement or Origen. In fact, the net result of a careful examination of the Christian documents of the third century can be only a conviction that in those one hundred

⁶² Pædag. II, 1; II, 10, et.

⁶³ Contra Celsum, I, 1.

years there fell from the pen of not one writer, east or west, a sure undeniable reference to a phenomenon alleged to have been of weekly if not of daily occurrence throughout the whole Church. The significance of this conclusion must speak for itself.

The fourth century, however, yields a generous supply of texts, mostly from the various Church Ordinances, which show a vigorously flourishing Agapé. But it was not the Agapé of earlier days. Though it was perhaps, chronologically, a reminiscence of the primitive liturgical Agapé, it was essentially a survival or a transformation of a foreign and totally different institution, that of the pagan semi-religious, semi-social feastings. Towards the end of the century it degenerated very rapidly; it became first unrecognizable as a symbolic feast of love, and then even intolerable as a means of Christian charity. The Agapæ were changed into funeral feasts, banquets, or meals at the graves of the dead. We know the consequences from the indignant remonstrances of a small host of bishops, synods and councils. Regulation became impossible, tolerance would have been fatal. We hear of "gluttony" "debauchery," and of drunkenness so common at funerals as no longer to be considered a sin, and of Christians urging one other to drink to excess ostensibly in honor of martyrs, over whose tombs they were carousing. The abuses must have been notorious. They afforded a weapon of controversy to Julian the Apostate, and to Faustus the Manichæan. Augustine and Ambrose stigmatize the feasts as "quasi-parentalia," "so-called Agapæ," and declared that they made inns of the churches and Bacchian groves of the cemeteries.

Evidently this could not endure. The feasts were overwhelmed with anathemas; all meals in connection with any sacred service were abolished—outlawed as paganism—a lamentable fate for a custom that had been, at its beginning, a sign and symbol of fraternal love among Christians, and a part of the solemn ceremony that enshrined the celebration of the Blessed Eucharist.

JAMES M. GILLIS, C.S.P.

ST. THOMAS' COLLEGE, WASHINGTON, D. C.

WHO WILL BUILD THE UNIVERSITY CHURCH?

The Catholic University of America needs very badly a suitable church. Large buildings of every character are multiplying on its great campus, and in the immediate vicinity. Libraries, laboratories, and class-rooms are not wanting. But we all miss the noble architectural pile that ought to rise heavenward amid this busy scene of intellectual labor, and consecrate visibly the whole work to the service of Almighty God.

It is only fitting that the choicest of our University buildings should be a beautiful structure destined to shelter the venerable worship of Catholicism, to be an inspiration to all lovers of the fine arts, a home for the solemn and incomparable music of the Church, a stage for the religious instruction fitted to the needs and quality of our students, and a vantage point for the great Catholic art of preaching.

The City of Washington is peculiar among all the cities of the New World for its cosmopolitan character, the high intellectual average of its population, and the ease with which great ideas spread from it throughout the civilized world. Every year an increasing number of conventions and public meetings take place within its limits. Religious bodies tend more than ever to meet here as at a natural center. Only this year the Episcopalians celebrated in this city a kind of General Council that obtained for their body a universal attention and recognition. It is only natural that in the future similar meetings of Catholic dignitaries should take place within the limits of the National Capital. For such occasions a worthy architectural edifice is a primary need.

The Catholic Church in Washington should not be without a noble ecclesiastical building on the grounds of the University in which the religious life of its professors and of its students, lay and ecclesiastical, might find suitable satisfaction, and impulses of a high order.

There ought to be on the most prominent site in the grounds of the University an edifice in which the dignity of

our bishops and our priesthood might be worthily enshrined on the occasion of the annual meetings of the Archbishops and the Trustees of the University, representing the whole episcopate.

The growing body of ecclesiastical students need a large church in which they may carry out the ceremonies of our religious year on a scale commensurate with their antiquity, their solemnity, and their profound significance.

As the life of the great National Capital, destined one day to be the most beautiful and attractive in the world, takes on wider development, the University is coming well within the built-up sections of the city. If we had a beautiful and commodious church on the grounds of the University, the multitude of our Catholic visitors would always find at hand the occasion to spend a few minutes of prayer and thanksgiving to the Almighty in presence of the Blessed Sacrament, and surrounded by convincing evidences of the devotion of Catholicism to the highest spiritual and intellectual ideals.

Finally, we ought to construct here an enduring edifice that would be at once the becoming Tabernacle of the Most High within our academic city, a nursery of piety and religious sentiment, an open book in which all who entered would read the wondrous mercies of God in the redemption of mankind and His continuous love for all His creatures.

Who will consecrate to the honor of God this beautiful temple? It should be at once spacious and inviting, the flower of American Catholic genius in ecclesiastical architecture, a monument visible from far and near. Its tall and slender spire should lift the Cross of Jesus Christ before men and angels. Its protecting shadow should fall over all the homes of religion and the halls of learning that are yearly dotting these grounds in goodly number. Not only earthly renown, but the far more glorious, even eternal, reward of divine approval would forever be the lot and share of those ardent and generous souls who would devote to this work some portion of the worldly goods that Almighty God has blessed them with.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

BOOK REVIEWS.

Hrotsvithæ Opera: recensuit et emendavit Paulus de Winterfeld.
Berlin: Weidmann, 1902. 8°, pp. xxiv + 552.

The publishing house of Weidmann in Berlin offers for the use of schools select volumes of the *Monumenta Germaniæ Historica*, and among them the works of Hrotsvitha, the nun of Gandersheim, who in the tenth century, under most unfavorable circumstances, wrote a number of works with a distinctly literary aim. She became thereby a precursor of the great poets who were to illustrate the later mediæval times in Germany. There could be no more striking proof than Hrotsvitha's work of the vitality of mediæval culture amid the most distressing environment. Hrotsvitha wrote some century and a half after the death of the great Frankish Emperor Charles, who had breathed new vigor into the intellectual life of Europe. Meantime, the Northmen had devastated the coasts of the Atlantic and penetrated far into the interior of the old Emperor's possessions. On the east the Hungarians had laid waste the borderland of the German Empire with fire and sword. The sons and descendants of the great Charles proved themselves sad degenerates, incapable of safeguarding the material and cultural interests of their Empire. Men trembled for their property and their lives. How could they think of culture and poetry? When Hrotsvitha appeared, it is true, the accession of the Saxon line of Emperors had brought the dawn of better days. Still, the gloom of the later Carolingian era hung over the land, and endless wars offered scant encouragement to the peaceful muse. That at such a time she should inspire the inmate of a convent to sing in the strains of the great classic poets of Rome is at once a remarkable phenomenon and a clear proof that the mediæval monasteries were truly homes of an intellectual life and nurseries of such culture as existed. It was a praiseworthy thought to offer to students of history, and especially to the Catholic students of mediæval history, the handsome volume we are bringing to the knowledge of our readers. The publishers have done their duty well, for they have sent forth Hrotsvitha in an attractive dress, and withal at a moderate cost. Paul von Winterfeld, the editor, is a competent scholar, who has spared no pains to furnish us a reliable text, with an introduction that gives us its history and sources, and a life of the poet-nun, scant indeed, but as full as research and criticism could make it. Add

to these "*indices verborum et nominum*" as well as grammatical and metrical indexes and it must be admitted that the student is well equipped to do justice to our poetess.

Hrotsvit, so she always writes her name in the nominative case, was a nun of the Benedictine convent of Gandersheim in Saxony, founded in 852 by Liudolf, a descendant of the famous Saxon duke Widukind. The little we know about her is almost entirely gathered from her own writings. Hrotsvitha was born about the year 935 A. D., of noble Saxon parents, as is inferred from the fact of her being a nun of the convent of Gandersheim; for this monastery was founded and ruled by at least four members of the imperial Saxon family. It is likely enough that Hrotsvitha was a relative of the Abbess Hrotsvitha, who presided over the convent towards the end of the ninth century. Her first mistress of studies, our author tells us herself, was Rikardis; afterwards she received higher instruction, including prosody and metric science, from Gerberg, daughter of Henry, duke of Bavaria and brother of Otto I. Gerberg was very young when as a sister nun she taught Hrotsvitha. She was born about 940 A. D., and became Abbess not very long after 954 A. D.—the precise year cannot be ascertained. Hrotsvitha was perhaps five or six years older than Gerberg, and must have shown signs of promising scholarship when the latter initiated her into the mysteries of poetic composition. Hrotsvitha ever after was warm in expressing her gratitude to the Abbess, who not only taught her but encouraged her in her efforts to cultivate the Latin muse.

The rest of Hrotsvitha's life is her poetry. There we learn to know her as a true nun, devout, humble, and filled with the love and value of holy virginity. Apart from the Latin studies prerequired for her poetic efforts, she gives us some amusing samples of her inroads into the theory of scholastic music and arithmetic. Most of her similes and metaphors, instead of being drawn from nature or life, are taken from the Bible. She shows a respectable knowledge of many characters of the Old Testament. Her reading in the lives of the saints had been wide in range, and her mind was fixed not only on the incidents of the story and the characters of the heroes, but also on the reflexions scattered throughout the legend. As regards her love of the marvellous, she was a true daughter of her age. In her dramas she shows not the faintest suspicion that the miraculous is the enemy of the dramatic.

Hrotsvitha's first efforts lay in the direction of narrative poetry; she versified the story of the infancy of Our Lord, as told in the Apocryphal Gospel of St. James. Twelve modest lines dedicated

the poem to her teacher the Abbess Gerberg, whom she begs to undertake its correction. These lines, like the poem itself, are written in elegant distichs, some of considerable rhythmic merit. Others again are heavy and prosaic, and a few pages suffice to convince us that she had either never read the great classical elegiac poets, or had failed to catch their artful charm,—more likely the former. Withal, we are surprised that in her days, and in the retirement of the cloister, a German girl should have succeeded so well in mastering the intricacies of Latin construction and rhythms. Let us not be misunderstood; Hrotsvitha's syntax is not always immaculate, her quantities are far from correct at all times and her verse structure often limps. On the other hand, let us bear in mind that systematic syntax was only slowly built up by the Middle Ages, and was practically unknown to the classical grammarians. The poet-nun has a vocabulary almost free from barbarism. A closer scrutiny would suggest great familiarity with the most ancient Latin writers, especially Plautus, were we not reminded ever and anon that it may have been drawn from Festus and his abbreviators, or from grammarians like Priscian. No doubt as regards the specifically Christian part of her vocabulary, Prudentius was one of her chief sources. The more closely we examine Hrotsvitha's writings from the stylistic side, the oftener are we surprised by finding that many of her strangest expressions are supported by ancient authority.

The History of Christ's Childhood, or *Maria* as it is entitled by Hrotsvitha, is written in elegiac verse; its successor, *The Lord's Ascension*, which critics regard as the completion of *Maria*, is in leonine hexameters. But we meet with few double rhymes, and even the simple rhymes are often neglected.

As to the subject matter of Hrotsvitha's poems, we find precisely what is to be expected from a nun. She sings the heroism and purity of the Saints, especially of the holy virgins, the cunning of Satan and the mercies of God. Her themes are almost without exception taken from the legends and the martyrologies of the saints. She celebrates the martyrdom of St. Gongulfus, St. Denis and St. Agnes, basing her story on written legends, relates the passion of St. Pelagius, a Spanish martyr of Cordova, as told her by an eye-witness, and tells two stories of men who sold their souls to the devil but were saved by the intercession of the Blessed Virgin and St. Basil. In her dramas subjects of precisely the same character are treated; in "Gallicanus," the story of the martyrdom of Sts. John and Paul, that of Sts. Agape, Chionia and Irene in "Dulcitius," and that of Sts. Fides, Spes and Caritas in "Sapientia." The glories and trials of holy virginity are

sung in "Abraham," "Pafnutius," and incidentally in nearly all the plays in which the immediate theme is martyrdom. When we run over the entire list we must recognize at once that Hrotsvitha's literary work was the natural outgrowth of her daily life in the cloister. This would surely suggest the celebration of virginity and its heroines, while her Saxon nationality, the short time elapsed since the conversion of her people to the faith, the descent of Liudolf, the founder of the monastery at Gandersheim, from Widukind the Saxon chief who first opposed Christianity with all his might and finally became its zealous advocate, would lead her to praise the champions of the faith, and to expose the cruelties of its heathen persecutors.


If literary appreciation and creative power, as evidenced in her narrative poems, deserve our attention, her dramatic efforts are still more worthy of notice. Whether we compare her language with that of the mysteries or moralities out of which developed the modern drama, or consider her taste, her vigor, and at times her power to conceive the feelings of a character in a given situation, we cannot fail to see her great superiority over the early mediæval dramatists. But what most surprises us is that a pious nun, unacquainted with the ways of the world should have succeeded so well in a species of literary composition, which requires, as all agree, a thorough knowledge of men and motives. What led Hrotsvitha to try her powers in this new and novel species of literature? She herself tells us that as many in her day read the clever but salacious plays of Terence, she determined to celebrate in similar compositions the praiseworthy virginity of holy maidens. The statement is clear and concise, and we may infer therefrom, without hesitation, that Hrotsvitha's "comedies" were not written for the stage. But what shall we say of her success as a follower of Terence? Whoever reads these plays without prejudice or favor will agree that, while of a high merit as compared with similar efforts even of later mediæval times and by writers more favored, her poems from their technical side in no way suggest that Terence was her model. She knows nothing of the three unities. Her plots, if the plays can be said to have plots, are without dramatic coherence, while the action jumps from place to place, and extends over months and years. Her love of the marvellous prohibits a development of her stories in accordance with probability and psychological truth. And yet, Terence, wicked as he is, is a master of dramatic technique. Hrotsvitha says that she wrote these plays in a dramatic rhythm and the manuscripts exhibit the text so as to show sentences divided up into periods which not unfrequently rhyme;

but the poet has not the faintest suspicion of Terence's metres. In this respect the poet-nun differs in no wise from her contemporaries nor from mediæval scholars in general. Indeed, if anything, her rhythms suggests the rhythm of the psalms recited daily by her in the office, with this difference that her lines are rhymed. Wherein, then, does Hrotsvitha imitate Terence? No doubt so far as the difference of theme and time permitted, first of all in his language, secondly, in depicting female characters only, as Hrotsvitha herself tells us, Terence relates the story of the disgraceful vices of lascivious women, while she celebrates the purity of holy virgins. Finally, she follows Terence by telling her story in dialogue.

We have already said that the subject of our author's dramas are drawn, one and all, from the legends or martyrologies of the saints; we must add that she follows her sources with almost slavish fidelity, so that even some of her finest remarks are copied bodily. Of invention properly so called, she shows almost no trace. Compare her writings, let us say with Shakespeare's history-plays, in this particular, and we will see at once the difference between a dramatic artist and a scrupulous copyist. Her method in this respect forbids all real dramatic construction, and justifies Hauck's description of the plays as a "dialogised narrative."¹ In two passages only do we meet with more lengthy insertions; the part added being in each case taken from scholastic philosophy. In the "Pafnutius," that saint gives his disciples a long lesson on music which, while quite curious to the modern reader, has no connection whatsoever with the action of the play. We may, however, extract a line or two, to show with what feelings Hrotsvitha and her sisters looked upon knowledge. "Not the knowledge of the knowable," says Pafnutius to his class, "offends God, but conscious injustice," and again, "The better one sees how wonderful are the laws which God has established in number, measure and weight, the more vivid the love of God is kindled in us." In the "Sapientia," the mother who bears that name, undertakes to confuse the tyrant Hadrian by a lecture on scientific arithmetic, which certainly puzzles the modern reader. Were the passage shortened and intended to produce a comic effect it might pass, but as it stands it is quite tedious, though Hrotsvitha herself, if we understand her remarks about the worth of the philosophical "patches" she has inserted into her dramas, considers these passages of special value.

It remains to say a word about Hrotsvitha's power to paint and develop character. If we bear in mind that her aim was to paint the

¹ Hauck, *Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands*, III, p. 300.



virtue of holy maidens and the heroism of Christian martyrs, and to provide edification for her readers, where Terence sowed the seeds of vice; if we then appreciate her natural directness, her single-mindedness, and her ignorance of the world, we will not expect in her plays any marked attempt at developing dramatic character. Accordingly we find that most of her characters are lay figures. The martyrs are all of one type, without individuality. Constantine the Great in the "*Gallicanus*" (her first play) is a sorry creation. Far more lifelike are the monks she has pictured—St. Paphnutius, St. Ephrem, and Abraham. Evidently her experience supplied to her the means of infusing life into these. But her greatest success in this direction is *Maria* in *Abraham*. She is a girl who, after taking the vow of chastity, falls, leads a dissipated life, and is at last reclaimed by her uncle the holy hermit Abraham. No little skill is displayed by Hrotswitha in preparing her conversion. Her fall is not psychologically pictured, it is merely announced. Her wicked life is painted in the most general terms; but even during her degradation her return is prepared by her remorse and her remembrance of her former happiness. When finally Abraham, who has left his solitude in disguise, sallies forth to lead her back to God and virtue, we feel that the woman who has never become wholly a reprobate, must and will listen to the call of grace. The suddenness of her conversion in no wise amazes us.

The sketch we have given of the character of these plays, will no doubt suggest to the reader that they are rather akin to the later mediæval mysteries than to Terence, or any classical dramatist. Their disregard of the unities, their clear suggestion of narratives in dialogue, their popular character, their devout tendency, all suggest this relationship. Can it be entertained historically? Most historians of the mediæval drama date its beginnings at least a hundred years later. Still Hauck¹ makes it more than probable that in Italy scenic performances were known in the tenth century. Preachers, like Otto of Vercelli complain of their demoralizing effects, and they were prohibited by ecclesiastical authority. As communication between Germany and Italy in the time of the Ottos was quite frequent, we may well believe that plays of the same kind were not unknown in Germany. It is, consequently, by no means improbable that, while Hrotsvitha was instigated to write her dramas by reading Terence and seeing him read by others, she followed in the handling of her themes the current dramatization of sacred subjects.

¹ Kirchengeschichte Deutschlands, III, pp. 308-9.

Scherr, the historian of German literature, and others after him, have inferred from Hrotsvitha's handling of the character of Maria, and one or two similar personages, that she must have seen no little of life before entering the cloister. To us this inference seems wholly unwarranted. The aberrations of Maria are data in the legend that could not be ignored. Besides, if virtue is to be pictured as triumphant, the poet must portray its struggles. This Hrotsvitha does, and she feels that when she does so even in the most guarded terms, she has yet touched on a delicate subject. But the materials of her story were provided in her sources. She neither enlarges nor dwells on the wrongdoings of her heroine, but simply puts into dialogue form the tale she found in the legends. That she should show some insight into the struggles of the sinning woman, is no proof that she was herself a sinner. A writer may strikingly portray the struggles of a murderer without having been a murderer himself. Whatever knowledge of the world is indicated in the writings of Hrotsvitha, she owed, no doubt, to the Abbess Gerberg, who had known the court of her uncle the Emperor. This is Hauck's view, and we believe that it accounts adequately for whatever worldly insight the nun of Gandersheim possessed.

A word about Hrotsvitha's historical poems and we have done. Impelled by her loyalty to what she calls her happy home, she wrote in verse the tale of the foundation and growth of St. Mary's monastery at Gandersheim. Her friendship for the Abbess Gerberg inspired her with her epic on the Saxon imperial house. She tells the story in all simplicity dwelling on the virtues of Henry and the others, without, however, touching on their warlike achievements to which, she says, a simple nun cannot do justice.

Here we must bid farewell to a most sympathetic character. Hrotsvitha is always the simple, humble, devout nun, and yet she feels that she must use for God's honor the talents He has given her. Her gratitude to her teachers, her true friendship for the Abbess Gerberg, coupled with profound respect for her as her superior, and her loyal devotion to the pious and virtuous men of the imperial family, her love of literature and philosophy, and her truly Catholic praise of science as God's truth will ever attract the scholar, especially the Catholic scholar. We therefore again warmly welcome Dr. Winterfeld's edition and recommend it to all students of mediæval literature and of literature in general.

CHARLES G. HERBERMANN.

NEW YORK CITY.

Development of Muslem Theology, Jurisprudence, and Constitutional Theory. By Duncan B. Macdonald. New York: Scribners, 1903. 8°, pp. 386.

If it be true, as Dr. Macdonald says, that the three antagonistic and militant civilizations of the world are Christendom, Islam, and China, this volume is one of the most useful that have lately been devoted to a philosophical intelligence of these great systems of human thought. The author is a good scholar in Arabic, which adds to the reliableness of a work whose materials are almost wholly in that tongue. He reminds us that the trichotomous division of his book is the result of necessity, adopted to avoid confusion and complication; only thus could a Western mind grasp approximately the system of Islam in which doctrine law and discipline are really one, treated by the same authors, touching one another at innumerable points, and very often unintelligible in separate treatment. "In Muslim lands Church and State are one, and until the very essence of Islam passes away that unity cannot be relaxed" (p. 4). Moreover the sketch is declared incomplete, not only because the development of Islam is not yet over, but because important phases of Muslim law theology and philosophy are passed over entirely, such as Babism, Turkish and Persian mysticism, the Darwish Fraternities and the Muslim Missions.

In the first section (pp. 7-63) a brief but luminous account is given of the domestic contests that divided Islam in the first two centuries of its existence, the rise and fall of the Ummayyads and their replacement by the Abbasids (A. D. 750), the great schism that left Islam divided into camps of Sunnite and Shiites, the transformation of the devotion to Ali into the belief in the hidden Imam, the swelter of revolts and insurrections that have never since been wanting in Islam and are now represented by those forms of "imperium in imperio" which are known as the Wahabites and the Brotherhood of Ali as-Sanusi, whose actual head is the inaccessible Mahdi of the African deserts. Every student of the early history of Islam can read with profit this description of the genesis of its government after Muhammad's death. In the second section (pp. 65-119) it is explained how Arab custom, Jewish law and the personality of the prophet are the oldest sources of Muslim law. The text of the Qur'an, the rapidly gathering traditions of the earliest days, their crystallization and the forgery of thousands of new ones, gave to the law a content and flexibility that were originally wanting. By the end of the ninth century of our era these had been logically classified by the great Moslem canonist Al-Bukhari, who selected some seven thousand

out of six hundred thousand then in circulation. Conquest brought with it responsibility for law and order in the conquered lands; hence the ubiquitous presence of Muslim lawyers. It was in these new seats of militant Islam that speculative jurisprudence arose and moulded the Muslim system, which was no product of the desert or the mind of the prophet, but rather the labor of men dealing with gigantic problems. They compelled from the conquered hard tribute, but they established a reign of law. The conquered world was for them, but on condition that order and duty were imposed upon all. Naturally the Roman Law suggested itself in the provinces of Roman culture and Christian faith. At least something of the old Roman legal practice in Syria Egypt and Africa commended itself to the Arab swordsmen of the first generations of Islam. Dr. Macdonald traces the development of Muslim law through many controversies, systems, and schools. Perhaps the most instructive paragraph is that which describes the "Agreement of the Muslim people" as the final source of all law—the conviction of Muhammad that his people would never agree in error. Positive legislation, equity, legal fiction, have done their part in Islam, says our author—"the hope for the future lies in the principle of the agreement. The common sense of the Muslim community, working through that expression of catholicity, has set aside in the past even the undoubted letter of the Qur'an, and in the future will still further break the grasp of that dead hand. It is the principle of unity in Islam" (p. 111). Elsewhere (p. 286), he expresses the belief that such future development in Islam can only come through an extension of education, an interruption of the slavery of the disciple to his master, and a biological study of the great world outside Islam, of the concrete realities of life as distinct from its dreamy infinities. *Alas, cælo supinas si tuleris manus!*

It would take us too far afield to deal in detail with the third section (pp. 119-268) of this book. Apart from the Jewish and Christian concepts in Islam, the doctrines of God and the Qur'an were the first sources of theological contest. The qualities of God, the Vision of God, the nature of the Qur'an, created or increate, were the starting point of infinite discussion. The four great Imams did not settle all doubts, and time and again the antitheses of the Mu'tazilites or liberals and the Hanbalites or conservatives, have shaken Islam to the core. The "odium theologicum" and its consequent persecutions raged wildly, although the sum of it all was little more than barren speculation and sheer hypothesis. Some highly gifted minds appear, like the Aristotelian Al-Farabi (d. A. D. 967), encyclopædist, mystic, and brightest light of the chosen band of

Fatimid leaders of Egypt in whom Dr. Macdonald inclines to see (p. 167) "a band of philosophers whose task it was to rule the human race and gradually to educate it into self-rule." Such another was Al-Ghazzali, the prince of Muslim mystics (A. D. 1078-1133), whom our author declares (p. 215) the greatest, certainly the most sympathetic figure in the history of Islam," the equal of Augustine in philosophical and theological importance, and the supreme commentator of Aristotle, who took up on all sides the life of his time, lived through all its phases, and drew his theology from his experience, after sweeping away all earlier systems, classifications and logomachies. In the Muslim West his influence was long felt by Islam, especially in North Africa where Berber nationalism during our thirteenth century found its mouthpiece and prophet in Ibn Tumart (d. A. D. 1152). His own mystico-pantheistic writings, a medley of Zahirite and Ash'arite doctrines, coupled with the claim to being the divinely sent and assisted Imam or Mahdi, secured for him and his Muwahhid dynasty a long control of Muslim thought among the Berbers. In Muslim Spain wealth and luxury brought about in the upper classes a deeper study of the Aristotelian philosophy, a spirit of compromise between its claims and those of the Qur'an, abandonment of emotional religion for the contemplations of the one Active Intellect, an effort to create an esoteric religion of obscurantism in which the thinkers of Islam might have a free hand to go their own way. Provided the bulk of the people were taught nothing but the literal sense of the Qur'an the philosopher, like Ibn-Tufayl, might revel "in the unwearying search for the one unity in the individual multiplicity around him," might lose himself in the one eternal spirit that he holds divine and in final ecstasy see face to face, either Allah upon his throne, as al-Ghazzali, or the one Active Intellect and its chain of causes as Ibn-Tufayl.

Passing over the names of Umar ibn al-Farid, the greatest poet of Arabic mysticism (d. A. D. 1260) and Ibn Khaldun (d. A. D. 1436) the greatest philosophic historian of Islam, whom Mr. Robert Flint has so sympathetically treated in the first volume of his "Philosophy of History," we come to the conditions of modern Muslim theology. Its twin poles are the ancient mysticism as represented by Abd ar-Razzaq (d. A. D. 1358) and formal traditionalism as represented by his contemporary. Ibn Taymiya (d. A. D. 1356). Against the adherents of the former, it may be said that the philosophy of the Muslim mystic has always been of a too subjective character, and leads always to sheer Plotinian pantheism, while of the traditionalists it is true that they have pandered to the stupidity and gross tastes of the illogical multitudes, and encouraged both hypocrisy and a fatal

quietism of the reasoning powers. Mu'tazilite and Hanbalite even yet, *servatis servandis*, divide the world of Islam.

The thirteenth century saw the incorporation of religious fraternities in Islam, whose members known as darwishes and "faquirs" have always enjoyed a special reputation for the virtues of asceticism. They are hierarchically graded and governed, and have their multitudes of lay adherents, who don their dress on certain occasions. Of the same type were the reforming Wahabites of Arabia in our eighteenth century whose militant puritanical spirit has passed over into the great brotherhood founded in 1837 by Muhammad ibn Ali as-Sanusi. Its present head is his son, the Mahdi of the African oases, who has a centre of propaganda and recruitment at Mecca. That this order spells trouble for Europe is clear to Dr. Macdonald:

"Sooner or later Europe—in the first instance England in Egypt and France in Algeria—will have to face the bursting of this storm. For this Mahdi is different from him of Khartum and the southern Sudan in that he knows how to rule and wait; for years he has gathered arms and munitions and trained men for the great Jihad. When his plans are ready and his time is come, a new chapter will be opened in the history of Islam, a chapter which will cast into forgetfulness even the recent volcanic outburst in China. It will be for the Ottoman sultan of his time to show what he and his Khalifate are worth. He will have to decide whether he will throw in his lot with a Mahdi of the old Islam and the dream of a Muslim millenium, or boldly turn to new things and carry the Successorship and the People of Muhammad to join the civilized world" (p. 62).

Altogether, this conspectus of Muslim thought in all that pertains to the state, to philosophy and to the other world, is both novel and fascinating. The general reader will find it worthy of perusal after Gibbon and von Hammer, and the student of philosophy will learn from it to what an extent the thought of Greece permeated the subtly receptive mind of Arabia. The Catholic theologian will wish that the relations of Arabic Aristotelianism to the scholastic philosophy of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries had been discussed, if only briefly, on the basis of the sources, as Dr. Macdonald has done for Greek philosophy and Roman law. Perhaps a chapter on the influences of Monophysite and Nestorian thought and discipline would throw some new light on the intricate processes of Muslim intellectual life. Nevertheless, the reader will find this positive exposé of Muslim theology both instructive and suggestive, especially when he reads the seven long and valuable extracts from Muslim theologians that illustrate the creed and the discipline of Islam. A brief but scholarly

bibliography enhances the value of this publication, which is a distinct addition to the best theological books of the season.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Histoire des Croyances, Superstitions, Moeurs, Usages et Coutumes (Selon le Plan du Decalogue). Par Ferdinand Nicolaj, avocat à la cour de Paris. 4th edition. Ouvrage couronné par l'Académie Française. Paris: V. Retaux, 1903. 3 vols., 8°, pp. 393, 548, 465.

When Le Play called the Decalogue an incomparable program of moral documents for the study of all human history, he only repeated what Leibnitz and Montesquieu had said, and what Saint Thomas had already laid down with the mathematical accuracy of a mediæval cathedral builder. In ten simple laws, that put eternally to shame the pompous and confused legislations of ethnic antiquity, the God of Israel mapped out for all time the world of morality, fixed for the mind and the heart of mankind the way that should eventually lead to truth and life in their largest and final sense. That "scrutator cordium" could alone perform the proper diagnosis of the weaknesses, evil tendencies, inherited dispositions, temptations, and common follies of a humanity that had become thus darkened in mind and enfeebled in will precisely by reason of its violation of His original behest. A truly ethical history of humanity could therefore find no better framework for the arrangement of its countless details than the Ten Commandments. This is what M. Nicolaj has undertaken in the three bulky volumes before us. That his enterprise has met with more than ordinary approval is clear from the fact that the voluminous work has reached a fourth edition. In ten books are disposed with order brevity and eloquence thousands of observations concerning the races nations and states of mankind from prehistoric times down to the present day, observations drawn from many sources concerning the follies and vagaries of humanity in all that pertains to the moral order. Each book corresponds to one of the divine commandments, and its pages are replete with facts that illustrate the growing imperfection and final degradation of all those peoples and nations who refused to serve the true God and made to themselves gods of earth, and even worse. In the first book are dealt with phenomena of naturism, animism and fetichism, the concepts of prayer and adoration among non-Christian peoples ancient and modern, the touching antiquities of Christian prayer and the helpless attempts of modern philosophic religions to satisfy these primary needs of the

human heart. Then follows a chapter on superstition, whose horrid details defy classification. Only when one has read it over carefully can he appreciate the intensity of the anti-idolatrous temperament of the primitive Christian peoples. They lived when idolatry was a social force, the living source of all popular morality, the established throne of Satan among men.

In the second book our author passes in review the historical antiquities of the oath, both among Gentiles and Christians, likewise all that concerns vows and blasphemy. It is pleasing to note that from the drag-net of an universal erudition he has extracted curious historical data that go to show how the oldest oath known to humankind is the Celtic oath by the seven elements. He might have added that it lived on in Ireland until a comparatively recent time. In the third book we come across a valuable commentary on Christian hortology—an account of popular feasts and religious celebrations before and after the Christian era. Here are described many mediaeval extravaganzas, likewise the “antiquities” of Christmas, the Sunday and the other Christian days, official and popular. It is a kind of “*Medii Aevi Kalendarium*” that to some will be the most charming chapter in a charming book. The fourth book deals with ancestor-worship in prehistoric and in historic times, a chapter being devoted to Europe and Asia and another to Africa, America and Oceanica, likewise an appendix on the simian theory of the origin of man. In the fifth book the destruction of human life forms the theme of M. Nicolay’s researches. Homicide, murder, capital punishment, infanticide, suicide, human sacrifices, suttees, cannibalism—all the forms, legal and illegal, by which the individual life issues with violence, are here commented on from the bleeding annals of our history. In the sixth book the history of luxury is told. Intemperance in food and drink, the love of the spectacular and the emotional, usual sources of concupiscence, are illustrated by many anecdotes that give an air of “*actualité*” to these pages. The passions aroused by “*meum and tuum*,” those horrid words, as St. John Chrysostom says, come before us in the seventh book. The author deals here with the antiquities of property, its emblems and symbols, with bizarre and curious imposts, corvées, and dues, and with memorable facts in the history of private property. The “antiquities” of thieving and of such small popular extortions as the “*pourboire*” in its countless forms, are, of course, very entertaining. Perjury, false witness, forced avowals, the torture, are the subject-matter of the eighth book. Here the reader will find many interesting data on the “Judgment of God,” on ordeals and judicial duels. Indeed, this work becomes often a very

useful commentary on general mediæval history. After the same manner, the history of human marriage is related in the ninth book, with many an edifying and many a disedifying page. Nevertheless, the chapter is one of a highly moral import, and the author would have it read by every maiden. In the tenth book M. Nicolaj̃ exhibits a summary history of robbery, by sea and by land, especially the corporate robbery of brigands, pirates and filibusters. A sad chapter on slavery and slave-trade, and on the "razzias" in Africa, closes the book.

It is, indeed, too often a harrowing story of human wickedness and stupidity that we are reading, and a certain "tædium" comes over us as we turn the pages of these annals of shame and impiety. Yet they are human documents with a vengeance of the kind that once Tertullian and Arnobius were personally acquainted with, and that once in Modin moved mightily a Matathias to protest on his life against such dishonor of the Creator. The historian will easily agree with M. Nicolaj̃ when he says in the preface (p. iv) that a deep satisfaction settles on the mind when, after a patient and sustained analysis, the suggestive allusion becomes clear in the emblems and symbols of the non-civilized man, or when these "shapes of shut significance," old myths and legends, shine before the eye of the spirit, or when science and observation enable us to group certain débris and trace certain puzzling formulæ, to align and unite them, to let in air through the mysterious labyrinth of facts, and light amid obscure texts, to lay open the most intimate sentiments of humanity; in a word, to cause to live again and to bear witness before the tribunal of history those who were once the contemporaries of these facts and these texts.

The method of M. Nicolaj̃ is a strictly scientific one. He proceeds habitually "de notis ad ignota," and mingles judiciously the pre-Christian and the post-Christian elements of religious life among the non-Christian peoples. The authors of antiquity are used with moderation, when occasion offers. His erudition is "de bon aloi," and his narrative clear, succinct and always entertaining. Judgments and reflections abound throughout these three volumes, that aim always at being philosophical and helpful to humankind by showing the universal causal nexus of the great divine laws of morality as well as the testimony of all mankind to their rôle and supreme sufficiency. The foot-notes of these chapters show that the authorities of M. Nicolaj̃ are always of the first order, modern and reliable. Thus in the first book, the reports and letters of missionaries are controlled by the travels of laymen and scholars, while the academic

studies of ethnologists like Tylor, Lang, Quatrefages and others are supported by the most modern historians of peoples and nations, by periodical publications of learned societies, by the publications of collections and museums destined to illustrate the idea of God among all peoples, especially extant races of savages and semi-barbarians.

Here and there a blemish appears. Thus (I. 217) the territory of Utah has long been a state. The work of Mr. Linn (see *BULLETIN*, viii, 402) is henceforth to be consulted in all that pertains to the political history of Mormonism. What M. Nicolay says (II. 305-306) about electrocution in the state of New York needs to be modified in the light of the latest results covering several years. The pages of each volume ought to bear the indication of the current chapter. This is all the more necessary since there is no "Index rerum," an intolerable omission in a very large book that abounds in details, and which is obliged to touch more than once on the same or similar subjects.

This is eminently a book for preachers, an eloquent and reliable historical commentary on the Ten Commandments. For whoever knows how to use the lessons of history in speaking to modern peoples, trained and fed on the historical method, this book can easily become a vade-mecum. Moreover, it is unique of its kind, and we may well believe the fact that it has cost the author a great many years of difficult and manifold research. The letter of warm approval remitted to him by Leo XIII. was therefore a well-merited one, and makes the work as desirable in cultivated families of Catholic faith as the approval of the French Academy vouches for its sound historical method and elegant literary form.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Reallexicon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde. Grundzüge einer Kultur- und Völkergeschichte Alteuropas. Von O. Schrader. Strassburg: Teubner, 1901. Pp. xl and 1,048.

The novelty of the work—it is the first Dictionary of Indo-European antiquities—and the impossibility of discussing in detail the merits of its execution in the space at my disposal, have led to the conviction that the interests of the readers of the *BULLETIN* will be best served by a general description of the plan of the work and a summary of the methodological questions handled in its preface. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that upon the answer to these questions depends the very existence of the method to which the rather high-sounding title *Linguistic Palæontology* has been given, so that their discussion is of more than usual importance at the present when there is a strong tendency to deny, on account of alleged defects

of method, the whole value of these attempts to infer from the vocabulary of the reconstructed Indo-European language the state of civilization of its speakers.

The purpose of the work is a double one of gaining on the one hand a clearer idea of Indo-European antiquity and of using this knowledge to explain the development of early European civilization. Accordingly, the author takes for his basis the early civilization of Europe as presented in the monuments of its history, and seeks to determine what elements in this civilization are inheritances from the Indo-European period, what are later acquisitions. In the choice of subjects to be treated, the general principle has been to include all elements that appear in the civilization of Europe before its conversion to Christianity and are not confined to a single nation. At this point may be emphasized as one of the merits of the book, the broad spirit in which the author interprets the term civilization. As an indication, may be cited the regret which he feels at the absence, on account of the lack of the necessary preliminary works, of articles on the different ethical concepts, cf. s. v. Keuschheit. The wish of Fr. Nietzsche, quoted from his *Genealogie der Moral*, Leipzig, 1895, p. 338, may be especially recommended to members of this University as indicating a fruitful and congenial field that is lying fallow "dass nämlich irgend eine philosophische Fakultät such durch eine Reihe akademischer Preisausschreibungen um die Förderung *moralhistorischer Studien* verdient machen möge. . . . In Hinsicht auf eine Möglichkeit dieser Art sei die nachstehende Frage in Vorschlaggebracht: sie verdient ebenso die Aufmerksamkeit der Philologen und Historiker als die der eigentlichen Philosophie-Gelehrten von Beruf: *'Welche Fingerzeige giebt die Sprachwissenschaft, insbesondere die etymologische Forschung, für die Entwicklungsgeschichte der moralischen Begriffe ab.'*"

The material thus offered is analyzed as far as possible into its constituent elements, which give the headings for the separate articles. To contrast the resulting tendency towards separation, related articles are brought together under a more general rubric, the result being a number of more readable articles. That this method of arrangement, which is inherent in the nature of a lexicon, has certain disadvantages, cannot be denied. But it is to be noted that the author has reduced them to a minimum both by not carrying the principle of analysis to an excess and by a liberal system of cross references; and that on account of the methodological difficulties, the form of a lexicon is in spite of, or rather because of, these disadvantages especially adapted to the subject.

As was to be expected from the author of "Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte" the method followed in determining what is and what is not Indo-European, is a union of the study of language and the study of Realien. As has already been indicated the value of the results of the study of language for this purpose has recently been denied, and so the author finds it necessary to criticize, at some length, the views of Koetschmer ("Einleitung in die Geschichte der griechischen Sprache") and Kossina (*Zeitschrift des Vereins für Volkskunde*, vi, 1, ff.).

Their objections to Linguistic Palæontology are based upon certain undeniable defects in our knowledge of the Indo-European language. Koetschmer's argument may be summarized as follows: our reconstruction of a word of the parent language carries us back not to a period of absolute unity, but merely to a period of closer geographical relationship and freer linguistic communication. This does not, however, exclude quite considerable variations in language and divergences in civilization. Behind this must lie a period in which the territory occupied by the Indo-Europeans must have been considerably smaller, and their language and civilization essentially uniform. Only the phenomena of this earliest period are primitive "*urindogermanisch*"—only such words as have a common ancestor of that period are originally related—*urverwandt*. Now, at any time during the second of these periods, a word may have originated at any point and spread, by borrowing from dialect to dialect, over a part, or over the whole of the Indo-European territory. Such words are prehistoric loan words, in principle on a par with the loan words of historic times. They may be common to all branches of the Indo-European family—*gemein indogermanisch*—and yet not primitive—*urindogermanisch*.

Now Comparative Grammar has no criterion for distinguishing between these two classes of words, and consequently we can never say of a reconstructed word whether it belongs to the first or the second of these periods. Furthermore, if—as is always possible—it belongs to the later period, it is not necessary for it to have occurred in all varieties of the Indo-European speech of that period. Its presence or its absence may have been a mark of dialectic difference. Consequently, when we have an etymological series that extends to only certain branches of the family—those that extend to all are exceedingly rare—we have no right to generalize and assume that because the word was prehistoric, it existed in all the branches of the family, and was afterwards supplanted in some by other words.

From this it follows that the sum of all such possible reconstructions is not the Indo-European language in the sense of being the

essentially uniform language of the earliest period, nor yet does it represent an essentially uniform dialect of any portion of the Indo-European territory at any time within the second period. It is on the contrary a conglomerate of words of different eras and of different localities. In this respect it is comparable with a list containing Greek words—in unknown proportions, and without marks of designation—dating from every period from Homer to the Christian era, and coming from every canton in Greece. It is clear that in the absence of further knowledge the attempt to form even the simplest sentence might result in the juxtaposition of the most incongruous elements.

Furthermore, the fact that a word does not occur in our list of reconstructions, may be due simply to a gap in our knowledge—we have never the right to assert that its absence in prehistoric times is proven.

These defects, it is claimed, are such as to vitiate all attempts to infer from this reconstructed language the civilization of its speakers, and in future, we must look not to Linguistic Palæontology but to Prehistoric Archæology for the solution of the problems of Indo-European civilization.

This conclusion is, however, much wider than its premises, it is the position of those who will take no bread unless they can have the whole loaf. It may be conceded that we cannot reconstruct the essentially uniform civilization of the earliest periods nor can we reconstruct a picture of the civilization that existed in any homogeneous part of the Indo-European territory at any time during the second of these periods. We cannot describe the way in which this civilization developed, the chronological order in which the different elements of civilization appeared, nor the geographical range of each phenomenon. All this we should like to know, but because we do not know it, it does not follow that we know nothing, or that what we do know is of no value.

On the contrary, if we consider the main purpose for which we attempt these reconstructions, we will see that it is not essentially affected by these limitations of our knowledge. We no longer reconstruct the parent language to use it for the expression of thought, nor do we infer from it the civilization of its speakers in order that some novelist may be enabled to lay the scene of his romance in prehistoric times. But we value these reconstructions as the basis—the only available basis—for the understanding of the historical phenomena. That formerly other views were in vogue when men were not fully aware of the complicated nature of the problem—when Schleicher was composing fables in the parent language, and the reconstruction

of Indo-European civilization was being undertaken in the same spirit, is true. It is also true that these difficulties are pitfalls in the path of the investigator who loses sight of them.

Hence, it is one of the merits of Koetschmer's brilliant work to have set forth with such clearness the dangers inherent in this method of investigation. But we must be on our guard against hastily inferring that because we cannot learn all we can learn nothing, and of abandoning the road because it is beset with dangers and difficulties.

Of these limitations of our knowledge, Schrader is fully aware. I have noted but one passage, p. xxxvi, "*und—wenigstens in der Theorie—wird die Zusammensetzung der in solchen allgemeineren Artikeln erzielten Ergebnisse ein einheitliches Bild der indogermanischen Urzeit ergeben*"—in which he claims too much historical reality for his reconstructions, and even this is essentially modified by the sentences that follow. It must be noted also, a matter to which I have already alluded, that the plan of a Lexicon, with its consequent analysis of civilization into its elements, serves of itself to obviate the most important of these difficulties. Since each element is treated separately, we are saved from the addition of chronologically incongruous elements, and the citation under each article of the etymological material on which the treatment is based shows exactly the attested geographical range of the phenomenon in question. We can make an Indo-European dictionary, though we cannot compose a sentence in the language. Similarly, we cannot gain a picture of a single stage of Indo-European civilization, but we can value and employ a lexicon of their ambiguities.

To outline Schrader's discussion of these arguments separately, the distinction between related and prehistoric loan words is not of importance for this purpose. It is conceded that the etymological correspondences were established in prehistoric times, i. e. before the Indo-Europeans reached the abodes in which history first knows them (I should prefer to say before the recurrence of certain phonetic changes which constitute the most characteristic features of the individual language), and that is the point on which the question turns. It might have been added that the deepening of our knowledge promised by Koetschmer from the consideration of these words can come only when we are able to designate the point at which the word started and the direction and the manner of the borrowing, problems for the solution of which Comparative Grammar at present affords no prospect.

The danger of the addition of elements of different chronological periods is real, but does not affect our knowledge of those elements, nor

must it be held to exclude in practice such combinations as are helps, comparable with reconstructed paradigms—to our understanding of these problems.

That we have no right to generalize an etymology is true, but when we say that a phenomenon is Indo-European, we do not mean more than that it is known *to a greater or less extent* within the Indo-European territory. An etymology that extends to only five branches, provided they have not an especial relationship like Indic and Iranian, or the Baltic and Slavic, and have not been in especially close contact, like the Germans and the Slavs, or the Germans and the Kelts, is sufficient to establish this. Reactions are always exposed to the danger of going too far, and the realization that we have no right to generalize an etymology has given rise to a tendency to explain all partial etymologies as dialectic differences. It would have been well to emphasize the fact that this need not be the case, and that the assertion of a lexical dialectic difference, and these are almost the only ones we know, rests always on the much decried *argumentum ex silentio*.

Very interesting is the claim made by Schrader, that a number of partial etymologies for the same idea taken together, are the equivalent of an etymological series extending to all branches of the family. No explanation of this phenomenon is given but I believe that it can be found in the following considerations. Languages, in their earlier stages of development, frequently show a surprising number of synonyms; examples are cited by Jespersen in "Progress in Language with Especial Reference to English." That the parent language should be richer in this respect, as well as in its sounds and forms, than any of its offspring, is not surprising. The later abandonment of this superfluous wealth would lead to the state of affairs found e. g. in the case of the word for "goat," when one word is found Sanskrit, Lithuanian and perhaps in Celtic, with derivatives from it in Slavic, a second in Armenian and Greek with derivatives in Avestan, a third in Latin and German, and a fourth in German, Slavic and Albanian.

With regard to the *argumentum ex silentio*, Schrader's position is that it is always worth while to seek for the cause of this absence of etymological correspondence for an idea that might be expected to appear in the Indo-European vocabulary. Distinction must be made between the absence of a single word and a whole class of names. Sometimes the obviously late formation of words in the separate languages will serve to indicate the novelty at a later period of the idea.

The real difficulty of this method Schrader finds in the difficulty of determining the meaning of a prehistoric word. Here help is to be

obtained sometimes from further considerations, e. g. from the Indo-European word for horse, we cannot tell whether or not the animal was domesticated. But the fact that there is also an Indo-European word for foal decides the question. Sometimes we must be content with a more careful framing of our conclusions. Sanskrit *áyas*, Latin *aes*, Gothic *aiz*, prove at least that one useful metal was known in Indo-European times.

Another way in which the study of language is of value for the study of the history of civilization is the consideration of the way in which names are given to new concepts, because the name generally indicates an element which seems to the speaker especially characteristic and hence allows us to better understand the circumstances under which the concept was formed. Isolated observations of this class are frequent, but it is only in the study of Indo-European antiquities that they can be gathered and employed so as to yield a fruitful knowledge.

So much for what we can learn from the study of language. It must be supplemented by the study of things. Of the sciences to which we can look for help, prehistoric archæology is the first mentioned. Schrader recognizes fully its services in giving color to our linguistic reconstructions. But deserving of especial attention is his pointing out of the defects inherent in its nature that prevent it from ever assuming the leading rôle in these investigations. It can teach us only of the material, never of the intellectual or moral side of civilization, and furthermore, it is of itself and especially in the oldest periods, without any ethnic relations and hence without any real historical interest. It gains such relationship only from the fact that the neolithic civilization of Europe as reconstructed by it coincides to such an extent with the civilization of the Indo-Europeans as reconstructed from their language, that we reach the double conclusion that the prehistoric connection of the Indo-Europeans was in the neolithic period, and that the great portion of neolithic Europe was peopled with Indo-Europeans.

For the employment to be made of botanical and zoological palæontology in combination with linguistic investigations, the author refers to his revision, with the coöperation of Professor A. Engler, director of the Berlin Botanical Gardens, of Victor Hehn's *Kulturpflanzen und Haustiere*, and calls attention to the portions of the field that are still uncultivated. Anthropology has in his eyes only a secondary value.

A third method is the comparison of the *Realien* and institutions, as they exist, or as they are historically attested for the different

European peoples. In this the author emphasizes, in accord with Victor Hehn and against Leist the relatively greater importance of the institutions of the Germans, Lithuanians and especially of the Slavs, for the reconstruction of the Indo-European civilization. Towards Comparative Ethnology, however, his position is one of mistrust, though he does not deny that it may be able to throw light upon the explanation of such institutions as can be proved by other means to be Indo-European.

Such are the plan and methods of the work. That the author has established the validity of these methods must certainly be admitted. Of the results of his work, I have no space to speak, but they may be summed up as the coincidence of Indo-European civilization with the neolithic civilization of Europe, a thesis that is not novel, as it had already been presented in the author's "*Sprachvergleichung und Urgeschichte*" but that has gained much in its second presentation. In general the etymological basis of the work is sound, in keeping with the present state of Comparative Grammar, and this in spite of the temptation that is always present in such work to press too far suggestive combinations.

In this respect, it has gained much from the attention that the author pays to the possible changes with the meanings of words, which is in accord with the importance attached to sematological questions in the preface.

The work will undoubtedly prove an indispensable part of the equipment of every student of Comparative Grammar and of Indo-European antiquities, and cannot, in fact, be neglected by any student of the antiquities of any European nation. Besides these, it will appeal to a large class whose interest in these questions is of a more general nature. To bring the results of scientific work before a wider audience is of importance, as it is upon their support that science must depend, and for the purpose of awakening a wider interest in such work it is to be hoped that this lexicon will soon be translated into English. It embodies the work that has hitherto been done upon the subject, and at the same time affords a stimulus and a starting point for further investigations. So that it might properly—had not the term been cheapened by much abuse—be styled epoch-making.

GEORGE MELVILLE BOLLING.

L'Ame Bretonne. Par Charles Le Goffic. Paris: H. Champion, 1902. 8°, pp. 392.

It must be the cruel sharp intense materialism of the last century, natural outcome of an epoch of invention and discovery, that has called forth, among other refuges for the spiritually minded, a renaissance of the vague and melancholy idealism of the old Keltic life. Latin, Teuton, and Anglo-Saxon have, in different degrees and at different times, exercised a severe tyranny on the native Keltic soul. Yet they could neither destroy it, nor annihilate it, nor quite eliminate it, even from the political and social equation. It is something so ancient, so subtle, so saturated with prehistoric experience, so buoyant and self-helpful, so rich in memories and fancies of the borderland of the spirit and matter, so conscious at all times of the other-worldly phases of human life, so easily projective of self beyond the caging limits of fact and reality, that it is endowed with a practical immortality among the great influences that fashion mankind. Since the eleventh-century Jongleurs of Normandy stole out of Wales and Ireland the material for their great vernacular stories of Arthur and his Round Table, there has been no such flood of literary Keltism as we have witnessed in the present generation. Nor is it wonderful that it should have been loosened in England by those solemn prophets of modern literature—Matthew Arnold and William Morris. For the constitutive elements of pure literature we must forever look to the Kelt, not indeed as the architectonic combining mind, but as the inexhaustible quarry, the source of inspiration, the bard-like leader or *vates* whose distant song forever draws after him all listening humanity. D'Arbois de Jubainville has shown the close identity of the Homeric materials and those of the oldest Keltic cycles. Indeed, who can read Lady Gregory's "Cuchulain of Muirthemne" or, better still, Eleanor Hull's "Cuchullin Saga" without feeling that he is listening to just such primitive strains of Aryan music as once charmed the dwellers on steep Chios? Stopford Brooke has proven conclusively the Keltic origin of the earliest English poetry, and Powell and Vigfusson have done as much for the Saga literature of the Northland. Radium-like, the Keltic spirit shines forever with intensity as the oldest idealistic element and force in our Western humanity.

Ethnographically, however, the Kelt has been reduced to an island in the Atlantic and to a rocky peninsula on the mainland of North-western Europe. His origins in the former are lost, not in the twilight but in the solid night of history. If any traces of them still exist, they can be read only by the gifted few and through rare and delicate

media of combination and intuition. Not so with the history of Brittany. Brittany the island made Brittany the mainland in historic times. The countless *lanns* and *plous* of the latter are the original semi-religious colonies created between 450 and 550 by an endless stream of Kelts from Britain, flying before the strong and resolute pirates of the Weser and the Elbe. Ireland sent indeed, her missionaries—where did they not go? The dear old hagiographer and folklorist of Brittany, the Dominican Albert Le Grand, tells us naïvely in his seventeenth-century tongue that “ce sont les moines irois qui ont versé l’eau du baptême sur la tête des Armoricains.” But it is from the island of Britain, then peopled by Kelts, that the peninsula of Brittany was first peopled and civilized in a Christian sense. But slowly. One has only to read the old but fascinating history of Brittany by Dom Lobineau, with the new and still more fascinating history by the late Arthur de la Borderie to learn that in this deeply religious land the way to Christian life and conviction lay through an era of violence treachery and impiety. For a long time, neither nobles nor clergy nor people have much to boast of as followers of the Nazarene. Abelard’s account of the monks of Saint Gildas de Rhuys, as now accessible in the brilliant paraphrase of Marius Sepet, may not be typical, but it is suggestive. Only slowly did the land come under the strong hand of the French kings. A Duke of Brittany was, until quite modern times, an unruly feudatory of the Crown. And yet in time the rude independence of its chiefs its churches and its people was modified. The Breton was merged politically into the contiguous France. Not so, however, that when his traditional institutions were touched with hostile intent, he would not rise in fierce and stubborn defence of them. His religion imports much tenderness and emotion. It is rooted in a local patriotism, the “amour de la petite patrie” and nourished by intimate domestic affections, and a sacrosanct veneration of the past as it yet lives in numberless monuments, not the least of which is his speech, principal chronicler of his history and truthful exponent of his thoughts.

M. Le Goffic has chosen to write of this “Bretagne bretonnante” the land of Breton speech and customs, with its bards, its “pardons” or pilgrimages, its countless local saints, its costumes and social ways. The gist of the book is in the chapter entitled “Au Cœur de la Race” a really novel and entrancing sketch or *croquis*. Only one of the race, one kin to Villemarqué, Le Braz and Brizeux, to Albert le Grand and Emile Souvestre could write with such emotion and picturesqueness, could describe so vividly the infinitely various ways of

Brittany, that land of "a hundred districts, a hundred churches, a hundred parishes, a hundred customs"

Kant brô, kant iliz,
Kant parrez, kant kiz.

The chapter on the "Curé Breton" is exquisite—"il faut le prendre dans son milieu de culture, à l'air libre, parmi les laboureurs et les matelots. Il est du peuple, pour le peuple. On le voit bien à sa charpente, à ses mains larges, à cette tête dure où languissent des yeux de rêve, les beaux yeux tristes et fins de sa race."

Exquisite also is the silhouette of Narcisse Quellien, the Breton bard of the Paris boulevards, a "primitif" who had to die beneath the wheels of an automobile driven by an Agamemnon Schliemann! The pages of M. Le Goffic are brilliant with the names of modern men of Brittany who have illustrated French letters, from Châteaubriand to Renan. It is a kind of Keltic encyclopaedia in which are enshrined hap-hazard the names of many Bretons who have arrested the world's attention and caused the "little fatherland" to be forever glorified in the busy haunts of men. Some sad truths are woven into the story—the growth of intemperance and the loss of Catholic faith by emigration. "L'Ame bretonne" is a very instructive book for those who would study seriously the Keltic "Wesen" in its own surroundings, apart from the stranger and the present, without alloy or admixture of any kind. It is enough to say of it that it need not fear to be coupled with the incomparable elegy of Renan on "La Poésie des Races Celtiques," perhaps the most spiritual note that ever escaped from the soul of that gifted chief of Agnosticism.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Portraits of Julius Caesar. By Frank J. Scott. New York. Longmans, 1903. 8°, pp. 182. (Illustrated.)

The classical treatise on the statues and busts of the Roman Emperors has long been the "Roemische Ikonographie" of Professor Bernouilli. Mr. Frank J. Scott has now made a notable addition to the representations of Julius Caesar that were known to Bernouilli, and his book will henceforth deserve a place in any catalogue of works dealing with the imperial sculptures of the best period of Roman art. The treatment of the subject is somewhat brusque and unconventional. There is no attempt at any literary history of the theme, outside of a reference to Bernouilli. And yet the author's own experience, as related by himself, demonstrates the utility of pursuing serious bibliographical researches before entering on the study of a

given subject. Mr. Scott, it must be said, declares (p. 83) that his intention was merely to illustrate pictorially and to discuss those statues and busts of Caesar that were subject to his examination. For this reason he spent several years in travel and investigation, visited all museums and collections where possible representations of Caesar existed, and devoted much time and thought to the material that he secured—many of the busts of Caesar were reproduced for him in plaster casts. Altogether, his researches appear to have been thorough and very exhaustive. It is not too much to say that all future students will want to consult his work. In it he has brought critical talent and a sculptor's technical training to bear on the subject-matter, with the result that a definite idea of the appearance of Caesar can now be had from a conspectus of many representations in marble, as well as from the portraits made by historians. The keen intellectual eyes, the large firm mouth, the high broad forehead, the long large head, are vouched for by the best of the marbles, and Mr. Scott finds in most of them the proof of his habitual kindliness of disposition and his dominant force of will. None of them justify the angry words of Cassius

“What trash is Rome,
What rubbish and what offal, when it serves
For the base matter to illuminate
So vile a thing as Caesar!”

On the contrary, the Chiaramonti, the Pisa, and the British Museum busts do not belie the eloquent grief of Antony, when he declared that Rome was looking on

“the ruins of the noblest man
That ever lived in the tide of times.”

The long digression on the life of Julius Caesar appears to us a “hors d'oeuvre” in such a book—the space might well have been given to a discussion of old and new literary portraits of the “foremost man of all the world.” There are a number of disagreeable misprints—Délatre (p. 177) for Delattre, Piambino (p. 97) for Piombino, Ludivisi (p. 98 and often) for Ludovisi, Medinacelli (p. 161) for Medina Coeli. When he states (p. 66) that the Roman hierarchy deliberately destroyed the statues of the emperors, he errs grievously. The studies of Lanciani in his “Destruction of Pagan Rome,” of Allard in his “Art Païen sous les Empereurs Chrétiens,” of Grisar in his “History of Christian Rome,” and of Venturi in his “History of Italian Art,” have placed the responsibility where it belongs—none of them blame

the Christian episcopate as solidary for such acts of vandalism. It was the wholesale pillaging of barbarian leaders like Geiserich that first caused the destruction of such masterpieces—even then a multitude remained. It is said that over sixty thousand statues have been recovered from the soil of Rome and the neighborhood. Gibbon himself says of the Bishops of Rome (c. 71) that there is no case known of vandalism encouraged by them. For long centuries the marble Caesareum of the *Fratres Arvales* existed at Rome close to the Cemetery of *Generosa*, intact in its inscriptions and marbles. As late as the sixteenth century statues of Roman emperors yet graced its niches dressed in the sacrificial costume of the *Arval Brethren*! The Spanish Christian poet *Prudentius*, writing at the full noon of Christian triumph, gives vent to his admiration for the art of Rome:

*Marmora tabenti respergine tincta lavate.
O proceres, liceat statuas consistere puras,
Artificum magnorum opera: haec pulcherrima nostrae
Ornamenta cluant patriae: nec decolor usus
In vitium versae monimenta coinquinet artis.*

As late as the first half of the sixth century, the Roman *Cassiodorus*, the Christian premier of *Theodoric*, drew up an eloquent formula in his "*Variae*" for the office of "*Curator Statuarum*." Multitudes of statues perished, it is true, but their worst enemies were not the Christian bishops, rather the barbarian despoiler of their rich ornaments, inexorable time and neglect, economic disaster, the peasant's limekiln, and the politico-social vicissitudes of the West since the death of *Chlodwig*, of the Orient since the death of *Herakleios*.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

As Others Saw Him, a Retrospect, A. D. 54, with introduction, afterwords, and notes by *Joseph Jacobs*, New York. Funk and Wagnalls, 1903. 8°, pp. 230.

This work, that first appeared in 1895, offers itself as an irenicon to display to Jews the essential Jewishness of Jesus, and to explain to Christians how the leaders of the Jewish nations helped to put him to death. The standpoint is the extreme rationalistic and subjective—only by accepting the attitude of modern Jewish rationalism can there be any reconciliation of the antitheses between believing Christians and Jews. Indeed, the work is declared by the author to be "an anti-gospel" putting honestly sincerely and without reserve all that can be said against what the writer holds to be the exaggerated claims of Jesus or his friends. The story of the life of Jesus is told

in the shape of a lengthy epistle from Meshullam ben Zadok, a scribe of the Jews at Alexandria to Aglaophanos, physician of the Greeks at Corinth. Mr. Jacobs arranges arbitrarily in two sermons much of the extra-canonical sayings attributed at an early date to Jesus. To these scattered sayings recovered by many curious processes from the first three centuries of Christianity, and to the text of the "Duæ Viae" Mr. Jacobs attributes a value "nearly as great as that of the gospels." The Talmud seems to be an authority only slightly inferior. Then from certain "outlying purloins of theological literature" he collects other original materials. The whole is set forth in a style of pleasing archaism, and with a running archæological comment. Through the narrative the cruelty of the Jews is minimized, the failure of Jesus to convert the Sadducees and Pharisees attributed to his evasive and dubious answers to their innocent questions, and His death on the cross is said to be the result of His "sullen and arrogant silence" before the tribunal of Caiaphas. The crown of thorns becomes (p. 197) a faded rose-wreath plucked from the head of some belated reveller, the Good Samaritan (p. 83) is no Samaritan but an Israelite, the demons driven out of the possessed by Jesus were (p. 34) spiritual demons of evil passions. So, by the exercise of a fantastic individualism, the gospel narrative is robbed of all its immemorial claims to truth and, under the pretence of popularizing the vagaries of a highly subjective criticism, the vision of a prejudiced mind is offered us for the correct portrait of Jesus as the Christian world has always cherished it. Could we stand by Marcion as he composed his evangel with a "machæra" or watch the process of Philostratus in constructing his "Life" of Apollonius of Tyana, we should be convinced that the morality of certain phases of modern literary criticism was quite like that of these ancient opponents of the true Christian tradition concerning the divine Founder of the religion. On the treatment of the original Christian scripture-texts there are some pertinent pages in Carl Schmidt's "Stellung Plotins zum Christenthum"—when we have read them we no longer wonder at the Christian horror and detestation for the writings of a Porphyry.

Mr. Jacobs is best known in the world of scholarship as a folklorist and an editor of fairy tales. This may account for his failure to recognize the broad gulf between the genuine traditions concerning Jesus and the "profane and vain babblings" that St. Paul denounced (I. Tim. VI, 20; I, 4) and whose echoes are heard in the "Agrapha" and heretical gospels, in spite of the abundant orthodox re-editing that they have undergone.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Life and Letters in the Fourth Century. By Terrot Reaveley Glover. Cambridge University Press. New York: Macmillan, 1901. 8°, pp. 398.

Professor Glover offers us in this very readable volume a sympathetic and scholarly study of many problems of civilization in the fourth century. His method is not a series of generalizations, but a group of portraits each of which he places in its actual environment, literary religious and political. Thus Paganism comes in for a satisfactory presentation apropos of Ammianus Marcellinus, Julian, Ausonius, Macrobius, Symmachus and Claudian; Christianity is dealt with in chapters on Saint Augustine's Confessions, Prudentius, Sulpicius Severus and Synesius. A chapter of Women Pilgrims permits the telling of the content of the "Peregrinatio" of Sylvia of Aquitaine (or must we now call her Etheria of Spain?), and another on "Greek and Early Christian Novels" reveals a literary side of the old imperial life little appreciated. In "Quintus of Smyrna" we may see how living and personal a force Homer yet was in educational circles, and in "Palladas" there is resurrected an Alexandrine prototype of Omar Khayyam, just such another *versificator insulsissimus*, with his budget of "quips and cranks and wanton wiles," his flouting jibes and sneers at life, literature, Providence, Chance, and Destiny. Each chapter of this book is a little mine of special information, for Professor Glover has embodied in each the best results of much modern research. To the erudition of the inexhaustible Gibbon is added that of Boissier, Hodgkin and Bury, not to speak of other conscientious writers. The reader will rise from the perusal of this work filled with what the writer justly calls the "pathos and power" of the fourth century. Read in connection with Dill's "Roman Society in the last century of the Western Empire," Seecks "Untergang der antiken Welt," and Boissier's "Fin du Paganisme," it will fix in the student's mind some true outlines of a period when civic grandeur and local misery were contemporary, when life was really mirrored in letters, and yet letters curiously affected to ignore the crowding signs and warnings of disaster that were threatening the ship of state.

Here and there are blemishes. The insinuation (p. 289) against Lourdes and St. Anne de Beaupré is gratuitous. There is no truth, as Ladeuze and Dom Butler have shown, likewise Volter, in the theory of the origin of Egyptian monasticism from the so-called monks of Serapis. The author's judgment on the philosophy of monasticism (p. 302) is without foundation. And it is not true as stated (p. 279) that "Antony and Paul are nowadays dismissed very properly from

history to the realm of fiction." To call (p. 114) the successor of Julian the "wretched Jovian" is an injustice. Dr. Bright tells us (Age of the Fathers, I. 340) that our Christian authorities dwell fondly on his piety and gentleness, and that he disapproves of the parallel made by Gwatkin between Jovian and the debauched Michael the Drunkard. Dr. Glover does not properly describe (p. 9) the so-called "Chair of Peter" at Rome, as he would learn by reading the admirable monograph of De Rossi, or the summary of it in Northcote and Brownlow. The curious reference (p. 4) to the United States as holding a "bad repute for lawlessness and want of taste" will be forgiven as emanating from a prejudiced quarter.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Age of the Fathers, being chapters in the history of the Church during the fourth and fifth centuries. By the late William Bright, D.D. New York: Longmans, 1903. 2 vols., 8°, pp. 543, 597.

There is needed no excuse for devoting eleven hundred and forty pages to the story of the "sæculum mirabile" that begins with Constantine the Great and ends with the Council of Chalcedon. The Duc de Broglie took six volumes to tell the events of those historic decades. Every historian of the period, general and special, feels that here the theme enlarges, the actors are filled with new purpose and spirit, the scope of human energy and the stake of life take on new aspects. Professor Bright is neither a new-comer nor a weakling in this arduous but grandiose section of Church History. He taught that science for many years in the University of Oxford, and devoted himself, with almost no exception, to the period before us. He dealt leisurely with the sources, amid all the bibliographical resources of the great English school, surrounded, too, by congenial and scholarly companions in the same department of learning. We are not surprised therefore, at these stately volumes, in which the public history of Catholicism is told from the accession of the first Christian Emperor to the death of Theodosius.

Nothing of importance is omitted, the chronological order is observed, and a due proportion is ever kept in sight, based on the intrinsic importance of events and persons, and on the abundance and reliability of the original documents. Fortunately, many of these are not only public but official—the authentic records of the Empire and the Church. Fortunately, too, there arose in the first half of the fifth century three men, two laymen and one bishop, who collected sifted and utilized these original and contemporary data. They

also made public, leisurely and in detail, the final impressions and opinions of the thoughtful men of their own day concerning a fateful century that was dominated and directed by the manifold controversies usually bulked under the name Arianism. We may add that a certain tragical finality was stamped on these materials and their first "Uebearbeitung" at the hands of Socrates Sozomen and Theodoret by the political storms of the fifth century, in which Roman culture government and letters all but perished in the West, and even in the Orient were grievously disturbed.

Baronius, Tillemont, Fleury, Natalis Alexander and a small host of Catholic historians, have cultivated this field of history in a way that leaves little to be desired. Its principal issues and their consequences, its efficient personalities and their work, are fairly well known to us. And, if we except such a find as the Paschal Letters of Saint Athanasius, very little has been added in the shape of original documents to affect seriously these earlier narrations. It is different, however, if we turn to the collections and editions of the original materials, to the critical refinement of historical method, and the multitude of exhaustive monographs. On these lines an incredible progress has been made since the eighteenth century, a progress large and solid enough to warrant a revision and adaptation of the ancient sources in the light of modern method and manner, and with the aid of modern helps unknown to our predecessors or imperfectly appreciated by them. All former histories, no less than all former views of the natural sciences, are henceforth subject to this process of revision and improvement. We do not need, therefore, to deprecate a new recital of the conflicts and viscissitudes of Christian life in the fourth and fifth centuries. History stays written in very few cases. Not only every age but every new generation loves to hear in its own familiar language the story of the past.

Dr. Bright's account of the Christological heresies is buttressed on all sides by sufficient information as to the general conditions civil and ecclesiastical. He is filled with a dignified enthusiasm for the great ecclesiastical figures and his attitude towards most of them is both sympathetic and correct. His style is usually rich and picturesque, heightened habitually by touches of local color, and by reminiscences or allusions that lift the forgotten person or site to a higher plane. The pen-pictures of Rome, Alexandria, Constantinople, and other centres of the famous conflicts of mind and policy betray an intimate acquaintance with the circumstances of the situation. As the book is entirely without notes or bibliography it cannot fail to interest the average reader, who will hear

in its pages some echo of a voice that for thirty-five years charmed a multitude of hearers at Oxford.

On more than one point, Dr. Bright ignores the progress made in certain directions. Thus (I. 35), Dr. von Funk has long since proved that there was but one order of penitents in the early Church, and that the habitual division into four classes is erroneous. It is no longer right to maintain absolutely that Pelagius was a Briton (II. 161). Dr. Zimmer has made out in his "Pelagius in Irland" a good case for his Irish origin. His account (I. 38) of the historical origin of clerical celibacy is open to serious objections. His judgment on Constantine (I. 45-48), is fair and conservative—some shadings of it are perhaps unjust to that great man and unwarranted by the authorities. Dr. Bright would probably have modified them if he could have used, before his death, the admirable introduction of Heikel to his edition of Eusebius' "Vita Constantini" and the "Oratio ad cœtum sanctorum." So, at almost every chapter, there is room for dissension, not indeed with the principal doctrine of the illustrious writer, but with statements and appreciations of minor import.

In one respect, however, the work of Dr. Bright does not commend itself to us. He deals unfairly with the primacy of the Roman See. Not that he shirks mention of the facts, he touches on many of the evidences that the period offers in favor of the supremacy of the Roman Church. But he shades and minimizes each individual proof, and applies steadily a negative criticism to all the documents and monuments. Here he is stern and there he is lax, according as the success of his special pleading demands. Nowhere is there met with the idea that this great volume of proof should be taken largely and philosophically, that the characters and situations of the deponents ought to be weighed, that language should usually be read as it was pronounced, without finical quibbling. An isolated case like that of the African Apiarius, concerning which we have not sufficient material on the Roman side, is made to overbalance a consensus of East and West. Another specimen is his treatment (I. 29-30) of the letter of the Synod of Arles (314) to Pope Sylvester, where the term "*qui majores dioceses tenet*" is whittled down to mean only Italy, and especially the City of Rome. Indeed, Hefele has shown (I. 204) after Noltke, that this reading of the text is faulty; it should be "*qui majoris diœcesis gubernacula tenes*." This is quite in keeping with what the fathers of Arles say of the Holy See as the region (*partes*) "*in quibus et apostoli quotidie sedent et cruor ipsorum sine intermissione Dei gloriam testatur*." Dr. Bright only echoes the quibbling interpretation given by Doellinger to the powerful

words of St. Irenaeus concerning the See of Peter. Men like the venerable Theodoret can appeal openly to the Holy See, and confess its rights as based on the apostolic succession, but the argument must fail because "of any divinely ordained supremacy over the whole church he says nothing" (II. 499). But *habemus confitentem reum!* As though the wearied old bishop of Cyrrhus should have written a tome ex professo to prove to the great Leo that he was the Head of the Church, when the appellant was at his feet as the court of last resort. It is a case of "*parole femmine fatti maschi.*" Dr. Bright might at least admit with Dr. Harnack that from the middle of the second century the Roman Church was "*de facto if not de jure*" the foremost church in Christendom. He might go farther and admit that the authorities for that claim usually put forth as a sufficient reason the apostolic succession. We need only refer to the marvellous words of the author of "*De Aleatoribus,*" probably himself a pope of Rome. Both volumes are models of the English book-maker's art, unsurpassed to-day in the world, and every way worthy of the great firm whose imprint they bear.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Ubertin Von Casale Und Dessen Ideenkreis, ein Beitrag zum Zeitalter Dantes. Von Dr. Joh. Chrysostomus Huck. Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1903. 8°, pp. 107.

Within a century of the death of the "Poverello" his work was brought to the verge of ruin, notably by reason of the heated discussions that arose among the Franciscans, particularly in Tuscany and Provence, as to the degree and the character of the poverty that they should practice. Though to some all such questions seemed as futile as the ancestry of Melchisedech, to others a positive answer seemed the first requisite of any sure imitation of the humble man of Assisi. In time, these domestic dissensions drew pope and emperor within their range. The fine arts, history, and even ecclesiastical doctrine, were more or less profoundly affected by the agitation of a multitude of exalted spirits in an age of yet living faith, in the crepuscular hour of mediaeval Christendom. A rude and appalling awakening was even then at hand. Only, a very few suspected from afar its character and its finality.

Dr. Huck has selected out of the ecclesiastical figures of the period that of the restless and disturbed Ubertino da Casale, a hamlet in the diocese of Vercelli, where he was born in 1259. At the age of fourteen he put on the habit of Saint Francis, studied theology at Paris for nine years, and was made lector in theology for the province of

Tuscany. He came at an early age under very conservative Franciscan influence, notably that of John of Parma and Petrus Johannes Olivi, the latter an ultra-mystic who died in 1305, and about whose writings there arose in time a conflict that affected seriously the life of his disciple and admirer Ubertino. After four troubled years as a preacher in Perugia, Ubertino was relegated, probably at the instigation of Benedict XI, to the dear but lonely heights of Alvernia where in 1305 he wrote his famous "*Arbor vite crucifixe Jesu*" in which the "*vilia hujus temporis*" are roundly assailed, especially the abandonment of the Franciscan ideal of the perfect life according to the gospel of Jesus—"ubique pungit spiritus Jesu in hoc libro pauperes falsos." During the reign of Clement V., Benedict XI., and John XXII., we find Ubertino in the front rank of the "Spirituals" or "Fratricelli." Dr. Huck is of the opinion that he was never a formal recalcitrant against the supreme authority of the Holy See, nor a heretic in any true sense of the word. His figure disappears suddenly and completely after 1322, when the conflict crosses the threshold of Franciscanism and enters upon a new and broader stage as a phase of the century-old quarrel between the "*Ecclesia*" and the "*Imperium*."

Like all the "Spirituals" of the thirteenth century, from Gerard of Borgo San Donnino to Petrus Johannes Olivi, our Ubertino was profoundly influenced by the prophetic writings of Joachim of Floris, a Calabrian abbot who died in the year 1200 and left behind him a number of works, mostly prophetic in their tone, announcing the near approach of a final kingdom of the Holy Spirit, to be realized in the establishment of a new order of monks, and not later than the year 1260. The influence of Joachim never died away—his "*papa angelicus*" is the "*papa santo da venire*" of the obstinate "Spirituals." His symbolic signs and symbols were even worked over in apocryphal writings that did service under his name. As late as the year 1516 supposed prophecies of Joachim were again given currency in a work pretending to come from a hermit of Calabria, by name Telesphorus. It had really been composed in 1386 under the title "*de magnis tribulationibus et statu ecclesiae*." In it are found not only genuine utterances of Joachim, but also apocryphal material current under his name with fragments of an Oriental twelfth-century mystic, Cyril of Jerusalem, bits from the fifth book of Ubertino's "*Arbor vite crucifixe*," and "*vaticinia*" of the Sibyls, of Merlin, Dandalus, and other supposed trumpets of the Holy Spirit. The Italy of the early sixteenth century was, indeed, a deeply troubled world. The Italian editors of the year 1516 color these miscellaneous

prophecies in an anti-German sense. The Empire is odious to them, and they desire the transfer of its symbols to the King of France. They foresee three anti-popes, an Italian, a Greek, and a German. The latter is the worst of his race, "*Germanorum omnium pessimus et erunt singuli ad invicem impugnantes et omnes contra verum papam.*" A bad German Emperor will ally himself with Turks and pagans, lay waste the Holy City, destroy churches and monasteries, overthrow the Castle St. Angelo, and level the Città Leonina with the ground. Ten years later took place the Sack of Rome, in which, curiously enough, many of these prophecies were fulfilled. Such books throw a "*helles Licht*" on the religious conditions of the opening decades of the sixteenth century. Janssen and Tocco, and before them Doellinger, have insisted on other specimens of this literature. The waning might of the mediæval empire, now shrunk to a small Austrian state, was no longer a fitting background for the Ghibelline "*Veltro*" of Dante and his sympathizers; he passes away forever as a political factor. But the new order of holy monks, "the twelve apostolic men to come," and the perfectly "angelical pope" lived on in the hearts and imaginations of the Mediterranean peoples, somewhat as the legend of Frederic the Second's return once incorporated the hopes of the imperial adherents. That such dreams could continue to affect serious men was chiefly due to the intense passion of the "*Fratricelli*" movement, a passion so great that it has left immortal traces of its raging in the poetry of a Jacopone da Todi, in the history of an Angelus de Clarenò, and in the art of a Fra Angelico. Heaven never swam so near the eyes of a chosen band of men—it was they who compelled a pope, John XXII, to formally take back his personal opinion that the souls of the blessed departed would not at once enjoy the Beatific Vision. Even when their formal cause was irretrievably lost, its spirit and temper haunted the purlieus of ecclesiastical life, even as the spirit and temper of Montanus and Novatian long claimed recognition and tolerance in the primitive days of Catholicism. In the minds of these defeated but convinced men we are forever in the state described by Ubertino in the famous fifth book of his "*Arbor vite crucifixe*"—forever on the very edge of the "*eternum sponsalium beatificatæ universalitatis humanæ naturæ.*" As late as 1589 prophecies of their beloved Joachim were printed at Venice; already, in the same century, several writings, rightly or wrongly attributed to him had been printed. Their vogue, always great in Italy, was, no doubt, arrested by that of the new seer "*Malachy*," whose prophecies were first printed in 1595—no manuscript text earlier than that date has ever been known. That

Joachim was not utterly forgotten up to that time is clear from the remarkable lines that Montaigne devotes to him. Under the name of "Malachy" the prophetic symbols and "signa temporum" that have floated down, through Orient and Occident, with slight retouches, for nearly a thousand years have taken a new and long lease of life and credence.

In the contentions of the "Spirituals," there was too strong an admixture of genuine Christianity for them to utterly perish from the affections of the common multitude. And so they created their own legend, interwove it with the most passionate aspirations of the mediæval heart, and stamped upon it forever the mark of that furnace of tribulations out of which it came. The personal note in mediæval history is first strongly accentuated in Salimbene, that oddest of Joachimites, and is nowhere more keen and insistent than in the writings of an Ubertino da Casale and an Angelus de Clareno.

This little book is a very important one for teachers of history—it justifies more than one correction in our manuals. Thus (p. 73), the tractate "de septem statibus ecclesiæ" is assigned to Ubertino instead of Joachim; an attempt is made (p. 79) to establish a list of genuine writings of Joachim on the authority of a thirteenth century codex at Padua; Dr. Huck establishes (p. 39) the correct spelling of the name of Ubertino's master in the spiritual life—*Petrus Johannes Olivi*, and not *Johannes de Oliva*; he establishes against Preger and Doellinger the exact original sense of the "evangelium æternum" of Joachim; he reminds us (p. 99) that the violent denunciations of the Church that Doellinger printed as from Joachim are not found in his genuine writings; from Ubertino's writings he draws the conclusion (p. 70) that the unhappy division of the order was already a fact in the time of Saint Francis himself—a fact that "*fr. Bonaventura in legenda modicum pertranseundo tetigit, quia nolebat antiquæ nostræ ruinæ initia legentibus publicare.*" (*Arbor vite crucifixe*, V. 7, fol. 1); a complete list of all known writings of Ubertino is given (p. 27); here and there a correction is vouchsafed to Luke Wadding himself (p. 34); he defends (p. 8) Ubertino from the charge of Cardinal Hergenroether that he was a supporter of the heretical Marsilius of Padua. One rises from the perusal of the charming study with the haunting cry of Guido Cavalcanti in one's ears,

"O povertà, come tu sei un manto,
D'ira, d'invidia, e di cosa diversa!"

We trust that the gifted author will not long delay the promise he

has made (p. 107) to present the learned world with a "quellen-mässige Untersuchung über die Joachimitische Literatur." It will be a welcome addition to the "Italie Mystique" of Emile Gebhardt. Few studies in ecclesiastical history could be more useful than such an exposition of certain sources of psychological extravaganza, spiritual folly, and disobedient fanaticism. THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Irish-American History of the United States. By Very Rev. John Canon O'Hanlon, M.R.I.A. Dublin: Sealy, Bryers and Walker, 1903. 4°, pp. lxxxviii + 677. \$5.00.

Canon O'Hanlon is certainly an indefatigable man. For more than fifty years he has poured forth the treasures of a manifold and a reliable erudition in all that pertains to the history of his native land. The local antiquities of Ireland, her ancient poetry, legends and folklore, her almost countless saints, have been illustrated by him with all the affection of patriotism and all the accuracy of a scholar. Alone, this venerable priest has brought almost to completion one of the most stupendous pieces of hagiographical work known to Church historians—the Lives of the Irish Saints in twelve large octavo volumes, of which nine have already appeared. It is a work that has demanded incredible toil, self-denial, research—for the historical materials of Ireland are as tangled as they are abundant,—a work, too, that should be in the library of every community where there are men of Irish descent. And now, at the close of a long and honorable career as a historian, he offers to the reading public a History of the United States, written from the point of view of an Irishman, to whom the share of his people and race in the upbuilding of the world's latest and most powerful great state is naturally very dear. In this work the chief events and great outlines of the history of the United States are related with model succinctness, brevity and clearness—any one interested in the story of the Union will read these pages with delight. They are among the best of many thousands that Canon O'Hanlon has written. But the reader who cares for the relations of Ireland and the United States, will find that every chapter abounds with references to Irishmen and their rôle in the creation of our state. A multitude of foot-notes furnish the justification of the thesis that no European race has contributed more generously to us of its life-blood, its energies, resolution and daring, than Ireland. Wherever ardor, self-sacrifice, idealism, were called for, the Children of the Green Isle have always claimed the post of honor. They are

found on the thin red line of battle, on the perilous margin of savage life, foremost ever in the explorer's party, the mining camp, the pioneer hamlet, the new state carving for itself a place in the great procession of communities that have been moving westward with irresistible destiny for over one hundred years.

Canon O'Hanlon has written this work with much historical skill. His sources are the best general histories of our country, the state and local histories of repute, autobiographies, and of course, the collections of original documents as far as printed and accessible. The reader will rightly wonder that the author should have been able to compile so learned a work at a distance from our libraries and from the daily output of fresh material. The work is also a very creditable specimen of the Irish book-maker's art, solid and free in binding, tasty in its pilot-blue cover and its delicate green page-decoration of ancient Keltic ornament. It ought to be in every family that prizes its Irish origin and in every public library that would feed the fires of patriotism.

And now some *veniæ* of criticism. More than once it has occurred to us that all readers of this book will not agree with certain appreciations and judgments of Canon O'Hanlon, while recognizing their manly presentation and the authorities cited for them. This is particularly true of the chapters on the Civil War. There is lacking an "Index Nominum," catalogue of names that are immediately or mediately of Irish origin. Such a list is essential to the useful and easy consultation of a book that deals with so many individuals. There is also lacking a list of the principal works used in the compilation of the book. Such a list is not only a stimulus to the special student, but an instructive guide to the average reader. In another edition there might well be a greater abundance of portraits of distinguished Irish-Americans, photographs of monuments, sites, and other memorabilia. Not infrequently the latest and best literature is wanting. Thus we miss the fine monograph of Martin I. J. Griffin on Commodore Barry, and that of Michael Cavanaugh on Thomas Francis Meagher. Only an Irish-American historical magazine, devoted to such publications, could bring them at once and regularly within the range of the distinguished scholar.

Of the documents published in the appendix, the most valuable for our readers is the famous appeal "To the People of Ireland" made May 10, 1775, by the Colonial Delegates assembled at Philadelphia. Of this noble document Canon O'Hanlon says (p. 175) that "it was drafted with a force and couched in a dignity of language calculated to chain the sympathies and to arouse the indignation of a freedom-

loving people." In art, address and execution, it was "equal to any public declaration made by any powers or upon the greatest occasions." We could wish that some chapters had been added on the share of Irishmen in the literary and economic development of the United States, as well as a conspectus of what has been done by them in the service of religion. Perhaps the preliminary labors have not yet been done, notably that "Biographia Hibernica" which long since should have been placed beside the noble work of Mr. Gillow on English Catholics since the Reformation.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Les Principes ou Essais sur le Problème des Destinées de l'Homme. Par l'abbé Georges Frémont. Paris: Bloud, 1901. 2 vols., 8°, pp. 410, 427.

L'Eglise Catholique, Instructions d'Apologétique. Par l'Abbé Léon Désers. 2d ed. Paris: Poussielgue, 1902. 3 vols., 8°, pp. 288.

Dieu et l'Homme, Instructions d'Apologétique. Par l'abbé Léon Désers. 2 ed. Paris: Poussielgue, 1900. 8°, pp. 228.

Le Christ Jesus, Instructions d'Apologétique. Par l'abbé Léon Désers. 2d ed. Paris: Poussielgue, 1901. 8°, pp. 236.

Discours de Combat. Par Ferdinand Brunetière, de l'Académie Française. Paris: Perrin, 1902-1903. 2 vols., 8°, pp. 340, 299.

1. If one would measure the distance traveled by the science of Catholic Apologetics since, just one century ago, Chateaubriand dedicated to Napoleon his great didactic poem, the *Génie du Christianisme*, he must read these volumes of the abbé Frémont. They are admirable for their learning and their critical spirit as well as for the sincere enthusiasm of the writer and the sustained eloquence of his exposition. The *Destiny of Man* is the theme that he develops in six books. He treats first of the "actualité" of the problem, and maintains successfully that Positivism has not yet cast it out from the minds and hearts of men. In the second book he writes, as it were, the history of this idea as far as the sayings of great men illustrate it, and demonstrates that without a grasp of it there is in human society no unity of thought, no repose of heart, no happiness of our kind, and that it is the most inevitable preoccupation of all men. In the third book he considers the question from the point of view of the family, public instruction, public morality, and good government. In the fourth, he illustrates it from the masterpieces of literature, poetry and the fine arts. In the fifth, the great critics of literature and the great historians, ancient and modern, appear as witnesses to its universality and ubiquity. In the sixth, a stately and convincing

procession of philosophers from Socrates to Descartes express their unanimous agreement on the same lines as the critics, historians, and men of letters. In every heart the deepest stirrings are those which Jesus Christ stilled forever when He said (John VIII, 14): "Scio unde veni et quo vado." The book of Abbé Frémont is worthy of frequent and attentive perusal, worthy, too, of translation, at least in a compact form adapted to our needs and conditions. It abounds in that saving quality of genuine Frenchmen—good sense.

2. These three volumes of the curé of St. Vincent de Paul at Paris contain his popular instructions on God, Providence, man and the world on the genuine meaning of life as set forth by Jesus Christ, and on the nature, office, and work of the Catholic Church. Good and reliable doctrine, frank answers and explanations for a multitude of current objections, a style dignified at once and familiar in its "allure," a great love of truth and anxiety to make it both known and loved, are the characteristics of these small volumes, somewhat more popular and unpretentious than the foregoing work, but sharing several of its good qualities. The clergy that can produce such books is neither ignorant nor idle, nor useless to the common weal—on the contrary, it is deeply to be regretted that their native land does not profit more by their enlightenment.

3. When the great rhetorician Marius Victorinus became a Christian, the edifice of pagan literary criticism toppled and fell. We would not say as much of the value of the accession to the ranks of Catholicism of M. Ferdinand Brunetière. Nevertheless, it was in its own way an epoch when, in the very *arx* of that delightful science a great master of modern literary criticism deliberately walked out from the ranks of the hesitating and took the last place in the army of the faithful of France. Yet hardly the last place, for this brilliant layman became soon a spokesman of French Catholicism, a kind of Newman come out from the Philistines of agnosticism, or rather an under-study of Pascal, just such a lay preacher and confessor as the suspicious and timid mind of Gallic "bourgeoisie" is always turning to, be he the sugary prophet of Tréguier or the holy man of Tours. One of the best modern French ecclesiastical writers admits that it is necessary for the clerical estate to again secure the adhesion of the average man in the former stronghold of Catholicism.¹

¹ "Il faut renoncer aux injures, aux déclamations, aux prophéties apocalyptiques et chercher à nouer de pacifiques relations avec les instituteurs, les maires, les magistrats, les députés, les sénateurs, les ministres et tous ceux qui tiennent en main les ressorts du gouvernement. Il faut convaincre l'opinion publique et, surtout, les masses populaires que l'Eglise n'est hostile ni à la science, ni à la démocratie, ni au progrès, ni au bien-être des classes ouvrières, et que ceux qui

Since 1896, M. Brunetière has often spoken to his countrymen of the supreme value and dignity of their national religion. Few know their France as the editor of the "Revue des Deux Mondes" and few, therefore, choose so happily the points of view from which to approach a multitude of noble souls who suffer mentally and spiritually from the absence of the ancient elements of faith hope and love, as they were once common to the average French heart. The mere enumeration of the titles of these discourses has, therefore, a certain significance. In the first volume we come across his speeches on the Renaissance of Idealism, on Art and Morality, the Idea of Fatherland, the Enemies of the French Soul, the Nation and the Army, the Latin Genius, and the Need of Faith. In the second, he has added certain admirable addresses made in the last two years. Why we should *now* have faith, the Idea of Solidarity, Catholic Activity, the Work of Calvin, Reasons for Hope, the Criticism of Taine, Progress in Religion. These discourses were delivered at places so far apart as Paris, Marseilles, Avignon, Lille, Besançon, Toulouse, Tours, Geneva, Lyons, Fribourg, and Florence; that is, mostly at great centres of human activity, industrial, political, academic and artistic. The work of M. Brunetière is therefore apostolic in its nature. This liberal mind, the *fine fleur* of the University, long nourished in all the traditions of modern French secularism, has deliberately opted for what appears to many of his countrymen a losing cause. The historian of his fatherland's literary glory and the preceptor of all youthful France in the passionately beloved field of letters and style has become, for himself, a herald of the great saving principles of Catholicism as alone equal to the moral and social regeneration of France. M. Brunetière is no ordinary apostle, and his discourses are no ordinary apology for our religion. In him the historic sense is original, keen and sure. He is the chief philosopher of literary æstheticism—hence his presentation of the religion of France to his fellow-citizens is sure to take on all the attraction of a realism touched with the sacred fire of a harmonious and persuasive tongue. Doubtless, the regeneration of Catholic France will be a long and slow process. But no Catholic the world over can disinterest himself from the task, so widely does the genius of France always radiate, so centrally located in Catholicism is that great land, so cosmopolitan is her ancient capital, so old and irresistible are the ideals, I was going to say the idols, which she holds up to humanity

l'accusent de rêver la domination politique par la restauration de la monarchie sont des calomniateurs. Il faut, enfin, et avant toute chose, rendre à la majorité des électeurs français la foi religieuse, l'amour des sublimes et constantes vérités de l'Evangile, qu'hélas! ils n'ont plus." (Frémont, "Les Principes," I, p. 404.)

for its adoration. In these volumes of M. Brunetière the reader will find the practical views and suggestions of a veteran judge in history and literature.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Codex Vaticanus No. 3773 (Codex Vaticanus B). An old Mexican Pictorial Manuscript in the Vatican Library, published at the expense of His Excellency the Duke de Loubat, Correspondent of the Academy of Inscriptions and Belles Lettres of the Institute of France, elucidated by Dr. Eduard Seler, professor of American Linguistics, Ethnology and Archæology in the University of Berlin. First Half, Text of the Obverse side. Second Half, Text of the Reverse side and Explanatory Tables. Berlin and London: 1902-1903. 4°, pp. 352.

Gesammelte Abhandlungen Zur Amerikanischen Sprach Und Alterthumskunde. Von Eduard Seler. Erster Band, illustrated. Berlin: Asher, 1902. 8°, pp. 862.

Publications like the above chronicle the high-water mark in the progress of Central-American ethnology and philology. This volume of the collected essays of Dr. Seler places before the learned world the principles and method on which he has hitherto proceeded in the decipherment of the great Mexican codices and inscribed and sculptured monuments of Yucatan. The students of this attractive lore will find therein not only inspiration, but models of the most patient and delicate research, with results of astounding value. It can no longer be said, as in the time of Stephens, Catherwood, and even of Désiré Charnay, that the old monuments of Central America are "perfectly unintelligible."

It is to the immortal credit of the Duc de Loubat that he has placed before the scholars of the twentieth century the "sources" of Mexican antiquities—history, theology, chronology, popular manners and institutions. At an enormous expense he has taken up the work of the ill-fated Lord Kingsborough and caused it to be executed with great success, both as regards accuracy and completeness of materials. It has been a pleasure and a duty to record in the BULLETIN the reproductions of these wonderful codices that we owe to the initiative of the distinguished American whose generosity places copies of the same in the great libraries of Europe and America. To one of the finest among them, the Codex Vaticanus 3773 (see BULLETIN, above) Dr. Seler furnishes a commentary in English, that is fascinating for the perspective it opens of a final intelligence of the written and inscribed texts that have long been the *crux* of American philologists and ethnologists. It is no longer probable that the splendid

publications of Mr. Alfred Maudsley will remain forever undeciphered. A generous Mæcenas and a new Champollion seem to have met one another at a critical moment for the eternal glory of human science and skill.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

The Workman. C. Beyaert. Bruges: 1902. 8°, pp. 135.

This is a translation by Rev. P. Grobel of the French volume "Les Catholiques Belges" of M. Beyaert. It is a touching appeal to the faith, humanity and manliness of laboring men, that they make every effort, individually and by associated action, to improve their moral and social condition. The language is so simple and direct, and the spirit of the book is so genuine, that it might easily become a source of inspiration to many if it could be made known to those to whom it appeals.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

De Religiosis Institutis et Personis. Par A. Vermeersch S.J. Brugis. Beyaert: 1902. Pp. 390.

De Vocatione Religiosa. *Ibid.*, 1903. Pp. 45.

These two works of Father Vermeersch are practically one study, the second being a supplement. The author, who is professor of moral theology in the Jesuit House of Studies in Louvain, is well known also by his works on moral and social questions. The volume before us is an exhaustive treatise on the origin, nature, forms, laws and institutions of religious life, written in accordance with the most recent decrees bearing on them. The matter is carefully disposed and printed in a way to make the reading an agreeable task, while a good analytical table and an index make it easily a first rate reference work on all points of religious life.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Konversations Lexicon. Herder. 3d edition. Vol. I, A-Bona-
parte; pp. 870 or 1740 columns. Vol. II, Bonar-Eldorado. Pp.
879 (1758 columns). \$3.50 per volume. 1903.

Staats Lexikon. Von Dr. Julius Bachem. 2 aufl. Vol. IV. Möser-
Sismondi. Pp. 720 or 1440 col. \$4.75. Herder, 1903. Complete
in 5 volumes.

1. This third edition of the "Konversations Lexicon" of Herder is a splendid achievement from every point of view. The work is intended to be a popular encyclopæia, bringing within reasonable compass and making accessible at moderate expense, all such information as current culture and general scholarship demand. Thus it is that one finds the natural, the biological, the social sciences, history,

biography, art, theology and religion, not to mention other sources, furnishing a most interesting variety of information to the general reader. A carefully prepared system of abbreviation is employed, by means of which a fairly exhaustive treatment is made possible in relatively narrow limits. The lexicon, while keeping this general purpose well in mind, has the added and no less important aim of presenting subjects in sympathy with the positive doctrinal and historical elements of Catholicity. The Church as an historical institution and vital element of civilization receives, therefore, such notice as her character and dignity merit. The illustrations throughout the work are superb. The plates used with the articles on Egyptian and Early Christian Art, Architecture and Sculpture, as well as many others, and the drawings and maps are the equal of any that modern skill has produced for book purposes. Paper, binding and printing are up to Herder's usual standard of excellence, hence the Lexicon may be recommended as in every way worthy of widest circulation.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

2. The fourth volume of the "Staats Lexikon," now issuing from Herder's press, has just been received. The earlier volumes were briefly reviewed in former numbers of the BULLETIN. Reserving a general notice of the whole work until the last volume appears it may be said that Vol. IV is in keeping with all expectations. The best known and ablest of the Catholic scholars of Germany are among the contributors to the Lexikon. Further proof of the value of the work can scarcely be asked.

WILLIAM J. KERBY.

Les Combattants Français de la Guerre Americaine, 1778-1783.

Listes établies d'après les documents authentiques déposés aux Archives Nationales et aux Archives du Ministère de la Guerre, publiés par les soins du Ministre des Affaires Etrangères. Paris: Ancienne Maison Quantin. 1903. 8°, pp. xii + 327.

From February 6, 1778, to September 3, 1782, France was the ally of the United States in its heroic effort to establish independence and liberty. The fleets and the armies of France coöperated during nearly six years with the young republic. All classes and conditions of Frenchmen found a place in the great struggle—foremost among them the Irish regiments of Dillon and Walsh. But the names of most of these brave men were hitherto buried in oblivion in such records of the French monarchy as are yet preserved at Paris. Owing to the initiative of the French section of the Sons of the Revolution and to the zeal of Mr. H. Merou, Consul-General of France at Chicago,

these military and naval registers are now printed for the first time. Of the Irish regiments, however, only the names of the officers are printed. Some sixty French chaplains who accompanied the various fleets, are also carried on the rolls, an interesting contribution to the beginnings of our Church history. The work is handsomely illustrated with portraits of the principal French officers, and is a notable addition to the "sources" of American Revolutionary history.

Repertoire Alphabetique des Theses de Doctorat és lettres des Universités françaises, 1810-1900, avec table chronologique par universités et table détaillée des matières. Par M. Albert Marie. Paris: Picard, 1903. 8°, pp. 226.

This small volume fills a notable bibliographical need. It contains, in alphabetical order, the author-names and titles of very nearly all the university dissertations offered in France during the last century for the doctorate. They number 2182, and by far the greater number were offered to the University at Paris, no slight evidence of the success of the academic centralization effected by Napoleon.

The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII. translations from approved sources, with preface by Rev. John T. Wynne, S.J. New York: Benziger, 1903. 8°, pp. 580.

The most active minds in Christendom have usually been those of the Popes of Rome. Our theological literature would be considerably diminished if we were to lose from it a multitude of important documents contributed by them, and touching on every large question of philosophical or theological interest. This is equally true of the domains of history and political science in its many forms. In the vast mass of writings that we owe to them it is usually the functions of headship that appear most prominently—they are the primary directive force in the life of Catholicism. By reason of their peculiar position they have always affected the oldest form of Christian composition—the epistolary, and the oldest way of reaching the faithful, through the episcopate. There is no real difference of form between the Letter of Saint Clement of Rome to the Church of Corinth, the *tractatus* of the fourth-century popes to bishops of Spain and Gaul, the highly personal correspondence of a St. Gregory the Great, and the Letters of a pope of the nineteenth century. In content and spirit, in argument and purpose, they are chapters in one continuous story of surpassing solemnity and grandeur. Such correspondence

as a rule is world-wide in its range, permanent in its interest, and far-reaching in its consequences. All collections of such superior historical materials, in any shape, are welcomed by students of history, for they place before all readers a class of public documents whose value, social, religious, and psychological, transcends that of all other materials known to man, were they the library of Alexandria.

Leo XIII. lived and worked in a period that may well be called crucial, whether we consider the magnitude and complexity of the events that fill it, or the skill and boldness and consciousness of the chief actors, or the philosophical light and temper in which they usually approach their work, or the universal and splendid academical equipment for all studies preparatory to decisive acts and policies.

His masterly exposition of Catholic doctrine had therefore a suitable setting. And his long pontificate, his varied experience of life, his literary taste and skill, his personal attainments in theology and philosophy, his liberal sympathies with all that was worthy and possible in our modern aspirations, furnished him with the mental equipment needed for the masterly treatment of so many varied themes. The "*Acta Leonis XIII.*" contain, of course, the original Latin of all his important utterances. In that stately language the student will love to read the teachings of the Church as they came from the mouth of a genuine scholar. But the translations garnered by Father Wynne will open the substance of this teaching to many superior minds and hearts, tossed on the flood of opinion and doubt, and looking for some broad haven in which to enjoy the peace of faith and the calm of final conviction. THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

Edgar, or From Atheism to the Full Truth. By Louis von Hammerstein, S.J. St. Louis: Herder, 1903. 8°, pp. 355.

A Systematic Study of the Catholic Religion. By Charles Coppens, S.J. St. Louis: Herder, 1903. 8°, pp. 370.

1. In the form of an interesting dialogue Fr. von Hammerstein has dealt with the current objections of materialists and rationalists against the Christian religion and Catholicism. They centre usually about God, Redemption and the Church. Hence, in the first section are expounded the principle of faith, the doctrine of the creation, the divine origin of justice and duty, of future happiness and the Catholic concept of miracles. In a second section he deals with the main facts of Our Lord's life, with the Books of the New Testament, the prophecies and their fulfilment, and with the usual objections to these elements of Christian faith. In the third section are treated

the true nature of the Church, the principle of authority in religion, the evidences of it in councils and creeds, the headship of Catholicism. Justification, Grace, the salient points of the Tridentine Confession and the Reformation are touched on briefly but instructively. In a pleasing preface Fr. Conway calls attention to the quiet and dispassionate character of this little work, and declares it "a clear, concise, simple exposition of Catholic teaching, warm with fervor of Christian charity and apostolic zeal." We subscribe to this judgment, and wish the work a wide circulation. In spite of an extended table of contents, it very much needs an index. The style of the translation is good, so good that the work reads like an original.

2. Fr. Coppens has rendered a service to Catholic laymen, and to non-Catholics by this summary of the larger work of his confrère, Father Hunter. He follows the general plan of this author's "Outlines of Dogmatic Theology," and reproduces in abridgment many of its judicious explanations, "finding them peculiarly well-adapted to the habits of English-speaking students." For those who have not at hand the work of Father Hunter, this adaptation will be welcome.

University and Other Sermons. By Mandell Creighton, sometime Bishop of London; edited by Louise Creighton. New York: Longmans, 1903. 8°, pp. 271.

Discourses on War. By William Ellery Channing, with an introduction by Edwin D. Mead. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. lxi + 229.

These discourses of Bishop Creighton breathe his irenic and scholarly spirit. Occasionally his theology and his reading of history differ sharply from Catholic positions, but the tone of his speech is always elevated and inspiring. Not a little of gentle dreamy mysticism is to be found in these pages. And his reputation for fairness in the writing of history is well sustained by the discourse "On the Work of the Monasteries," in which he takes a position quite close to that of Dom Gasquet.

2. The discourses of William Ellery Channing on the evils and the horrors of war are classical texts among the lovers of peace. Dr. Channing was profoundly touched by the contradiction between the true Christian spirit and the military spirit. The one was the embodiment of love and the condition of genuine human progress, the other the embodiment of hate and all moral degradation. These discourses are always timely and pertinent among us, for they were brought forth by crises in our own national life, crises that Dr.

Channing did not fear to judge from a fundamentally Christian point of view, however unpopular that might have been with his contemporaries. The discourses, or rather essays on the great war-lord, Napoleon, are good specimens of the splendid eloquence which this rarely gifted speaker and writer displayed in the early days of our national life, of the literary perfection of his style, and of the richness warmth and delicate coloring of his diction.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

English History Illustrated from Original Sources, 1399-1485.

By F. H. Durham. London: Adam and Charles Black (Macmillan), 1902. 8°, pp. 141.

English History Illustrated from Original Sources, 1660-1715.

By J. Neville Figgis. Ibid., 1902. 8°, pp. 207.

These handy volumes contain brief excerpts from the original materials of each of the great periods of English history. The idea is an excellent one, to put before the young student of history something more than a list of dates and names. The chronicles of a period, its letters, reports, mémoires, even the great public documents, have a lively charm about them that always fascinates. The antiquated diction alone quickens the interest of a youthful reader, who soon seizes a personality in the narrator, gauges his interest in the facts, and thus has his own critical spirit gently but healthily aroused. Each volume is prefaced by a short introduction, and accompanied by a select bibliography of published original sources, by notes on the writers of the same, and by genealogical tables to which brief comments are added in explanation. It would be an admirable work to prepare a similar series for our Catholic high schools, academies and colleges, since there are many elements and factors of pre-Reformation history that we cannot expect non-Catholics to appreciate or to treat with such intelligent sympathy as we should rightly manifest. This is all the more important as in the mediæval period Catholicism was not only the popular and universal form of religion, but was the great moulding force of all English life, public and private.

The editor well says (p. vii) that by the use of such books infinitely better results are gotten from the classes of history than from mere reading and questioning on a text-book. It compels the teacher to study and assimilate in order to explain by word of mouth. It moves the pupil to notice cause and effect, and to draw his own inferences. It familiarizes him with the views of life taken by contemporaries and widens his mental horizon in an agreeable and natural way. Illustrations accompany the text, portraits and historical scenes, that

appeal strongly to the imagination of the young reader and satisfy his curiosity as to details of dress and appearance.

THOMAS J. SHAHAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED.

Manual of Mystical Theology. By A. Devine. London, R. and T. Washbourne. 1903. 8°, pp. 664.

Institutiones Philosophiæ Moralis et Socialis quas in Collegio Maximo Lovaniensi Societatis Jesu tradebat A. Castelein, S.J. Bruxelles Société Belge de Librairie. 1903. 2 vols., 8°, pp. —.

Decreta Synodorum Hartfordiensium in unum volumen collecta, antistitis Michaelis Tierney jussu. Hartfordiæ, Conn., 1903. 8°, pp. 334.

Die Heilsnotwendigkeit in der althristlichen Litteratur bis zur Zeit des heiligen Augustinus. Von Anton Seitz. Freiburg: Herder, 1903. 8°, pp. 416.

Prælectiones de Missa, cum appendice de SS. Eucharistiæ sacramento, auctore S. Many. Paris: Letouzey et Ané, 1903. 8°, pp. 400.

Die Elemente der Eucharistie in der ersten drei Jahrhunderten. Von Alois Scheiweiler (Forschungen zur christlichen Litteratur und Dogmengeschichte III, 4). Mainz: Kirchheim, 1903. 8°, pp. —.

La Vacanza della Santa Sede, Il Conclave, l'Elezione del Nuovo Papa. Per Mons Pietro Piacenza. Rome: Pustet. 16°, pp. 95.

Ways of the Six-footed. By Anna Botsford Comstock, B.S. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 152.

The Insect Folk. By Margaret Warner Morley. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 196.

Agriculture for Beginners. By Charles William Berkett, Frank Lincoln Stevens and Daniel Harvey Hill. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 267.

The New Century Catholic Series, First Reader, 8°, pp. 143. Second Reader, 8°, pp. 177. Handsomely illustrated. New York: Benziger, 1903.

The Jones Readers, First, Second, Third, Fourth. Illustrated. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903.

Moral Briefs, A concise reasoned and popular exposition of Catholic Morality by the Rev. John H. Stapleton, Hartford Conn.: The Catholic Transcript, 1903. 8°, pp. 311.

De Carentia Ovariorum relate ad Matrimonium, II. N. Casacca, O.S.A., Philadelphia: H. Kilner and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 20.

- Creighton University, *Reminiscences of Twenty-five years*. By M. P. Dowling, S.J., Omaha: 1902. 8°, pp. 272.
- Boston, *A Guide Book*. By Edwin M. Bacon, Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 190.
- The Students' Handbook of British and American Literature, with selections from the writings of the most distinguished authors. By the Rev. O. L. Jenkins, A.M., S.S. Edited by Rev. E. Viger, A.M., S.S. Fourteenth edition. Baltimore: John Murphy Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 622.
- Allen and Greenough's New Latin Grammar for Schools and Colleges, founded on Comparative Grammar. Edited by J. B. Greenough, G. L. Kittredge, A. A. Howard, Benj. L. D'Ooge. Boston: Ginn and Co. 1903. 8°, pp. 490.
- A Latin Grammar. By William Gardner Hale, Professor of Latin in the University of Chicago, and Carl Darling Buck, Professor of Comparative Philology in the University of Chicago. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. 388.
- M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum Liber Primus et Somnium Scipionis. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Frank Ernest Rockwood, Professor of Latin in Bucknell University. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. viii + 22 + 106.
- The Odes and Epodes of Horace. Edited with Introduction and Notes by Clement Laurence Smith, Pope Professor of Latin in Harvard University. Boston: Ginn and Co., 1903. 8°, pp. viii + 443.
- Why Catholics Cannot be Freemasons: Foreign Freemasonry. By D. Moncreiff O'Connor, International Truth Society. Brooklyn: N. Y., 1903. 16°, pp. 68.
- Scenes and Sketches in an Irish Parish, of Priest and People in Doon. By a Country Curate. New York: Benziger, 1903. 16°, pp. 132.
- Sick-Calls, or Chapters of Pastoral Medicine. By Rev. Alfred Manning Mulligan. New York: Benziger, 1903. 8°, pp. 173.

THE ANNUAL COLLECTION FOR THE UNIVERSITY.

It is worthy of note that interest in the welfare of the University forms a conspicuous feature in the transition from one pontificate to another. Leo XIII, but a few months before his death, appointed the present Rector and charged him, in no ambiguous terms, to build up the institution according to the design of its founder. Pius X has scarcely ascended the papal throne when he addresses a letter to the American episcopate, urging them to place the University on a sound financial basis by means of an annual collection. The meaning of the Holy Father is, or ought to be, quite plain. What one Pope established the other proposes to maintain, because the same high motives are ever in force and the same sacred purposes are always to be served. The University has become part of the traditions of the Papacy, so far as the latter deals with the church in America.

This attitude of the Holy See is of special significance, because it makes clear the way in which the influence of the Church, according to the intention of the Holy See, is to be exerted in these United States. Much has been said and written of late to the effect that the Papacy is deeply interested in American progress; that this country, with its large freedom of action, opens up a rich field for the work of the Church; that, in contrast with European conditions, this Republic is a manifest expression of a high over-ruling Providence, and the like. That there is truth in such optimistic views, cannot be doubted. And it is equally certain that there are many divergent opinions as to the particular manner in which the Church should profit by her opportunity. But to the broader vision and the experienced insight of the Papacy, the matter is quite clear. It is by a more thorough cultivation of the intellectual life among our own people that we must expect to render service to the nation, and thereby demonstrate the inherent necessity of religious and moral education can avail but little

vitality of the Church. To discourse eloquently about the unless the right measures are taken to show that the Church is now, as she has been in the past, the best teacher of the people. To lament the baneful influence of this or that system of instruction without providing for real Christian education from the lowest grade to the highest, is simply a waste of time and sentiment. The only efficacious means of dealing with the situation is that which Leo XIII devised and which Pius X evidently means to perfect—the development of a University that shall be powerful enough not only to present the teaching of the Church on the great questions of the day, but also to diffuse that teaching through a system of properly equipped secondary and elementary schools.

The day is past for imagining, or getting others to imagine, that the University is so far removed from the life and interests of the Catholic people, as to make it no concern of theirs. The very local interests which, in each diocese, and even in each parish, come nearest to the minds of the clergy and laity, demand for their proper maintenance and direction the influence of a central institution. One might as well think of conducting the affairs of town and country with no regard for the Federal authority, as to think of improving the educational facilities of the humblest parochial school without any attention to the higher and even the highest of our institutions.

In consequence, the letters which we subjoin from the Holy Father and from the Cardinal Chancellor of the University are in every way opportune. Appealing through the Episcopate to the Clergy and people, they prove more forcibly than any amount of argument that the development of the University and the completion of its endowment are sacred duties incumbent upon all. And because this appeal does base itself upon the fact that the Church is an organization, not a mere collection of scattering bodies, it is the more thoroughly in harmony with that spirit of generous activity which has hitherto accomplished so much in the cause of religion.

It is hoped by all the friends and well-wishers of the University that a generous response will be forthcoming to the appeal made by the Board of Trustees in favor of the great undertaking. That appeal has been ratified by the Episcopate

of the United States, in whose name the Board of Trustees administers the University. The august sanction of the Holy See, both in the persons of Leo XIII and Pius X, has been granted to this significant decision. It has therefore, all the authoritative approval that could be required. At every step careful attention has been given to all considerations worthy of attention, and now the action of the Board of Trustees goes before the millions of our Catholic laity for that practical adhesion that they always give to the decisions of the Hierarchy.

By means of this collection the meaning of a Catholic University will be brought home easily and directly to every Catholic man and woman in the land. We may rightly expect from it a relief in the immediate future from the anxieties and fears that not unnaturally beset the hearts of all who had given to this holy enterprise their lives or their sympathies. We may also expect a still greater result, an aroused conscience and interest on the part of all the Catholics of our land. A very small number of individuals and a few generous, high-minded associations have carried the burden for fifteen years. Their donations have kept alive the work in the first two decades of its existence, covered the period of its infancy, and given a sufficient shelter to the first organization of a teaching that we hope will one day grow to rival the noblest and most useful of the Catholic Universities of the past.

There are nearly one hundred dioceses in the United States, with about thirteen thousand clergymen, twelve thousand churches, and fully twelve million Catholics. If this immense and united organization would only contribute for each person a very modest sum, the result would be such as to astonish the entire nation and reveal, what we all know to exist, a sincere universal desire to elevate our system of Catholic education to the very highest level, and to make, even in our pioneer period, such large and intelligent provision for its future as would compel in the centuries to come the admiration of all.

Collective enterprises, it is true, are some time in commending themselves. Local parochial needs not unjustly appeal to the individuals whose toil and devotion alone can create and sustain them. All honor to the brave and patient

generations of priests and sisters, of laymen and laywomen who have lifted the Catholic cross in every hamlet from the Atlantic to the Pacific, and assured the works of Catholicism in all quarters of this great land. But larger works constantly invite us, and with urgency; for they are needed to secure what has been already done. The Catholic University is such a work of universal Catholic significance; were it otherwise, the Holy See would not tolerate for a moment the appeal to American Catholic generosity that it now repeatedly urges, and with that grave and noble insistency that befits the Supreme Head of Catholicism.

1888.

LETTER OF OUR HOLY FATHER, PIUS X.

Dilecto Filio Nostro Jacobo Tit. S. Mariæ Trans Tiberim S. R. E. Presb. Card. Gibbons Archiepiscopo Baltimorensium et Magni Lycei Washingtoniensis Cancellario Baltimoram, Pius PP. X.

Dilecte Fili Noster, Salutem et Apostolicam benedictionem.—Quae de Washingtoniensis lycei magni fortuna, minus sane quam sit e votis laetabili, haud ita pridem significabas, magno in eadem animo curas Nostras sollicitudinemque convertimus. Vestigiis enim ut est optimis consentaneum rebus, Decessoris Nostri, in causa praesertim gravi maximarumque utilitatum, insistentes, libuit studia Nostra, quae in illustrem Americae Academiam jamdudum fovimus, servare in Summo Apostolatus munere, atque etiam pro facultate exaugere. Quapropter jucunde admodum novimus sic esse ab episcopis laudati lycei moderatoribus provisum, ceterisque, quorum interest, probatum ut primo quoque dominico die Adventus Sacri redeunte, aut, ejusmodi praepedito tempore, quo proximo dominico die liceat, in omnibus Foederatarum Civitatum ecclesiis symbolae ad amplificandum Washingtonensis Academiae decus conquirantur decem per annos. Initum communiter consilium frugiferum maxime censemus, cupimusque propterea atque optamus ut in propositum Academiae bonum et universae reipublicae istius episcopi et studiosi doctrinarum religionisque fideles omni ope contendant. Rem autem uti adjuvare gratia sua Deus benigne velit, Apostolicam Benedictionem vobis et gregibus vestris ex animo imperimus.

Datum Romae apud S. Petrum die IX Septembris MCMIII, Pontificatus nostri anno primo.

PIUS PP. X.

(TRANSLATION.)

"To Our Beloved Son, James, Cardinal Gibbons, Cardinal Priest of the Holy Roman Church, with the Title of Santa Maria in Trastevere; Archbishop of Baltimore and Chancellor of the Catholic University at Washington:

"Beloved son: Health and apostolic benediction: The condition of the university at Washington has enlisted Our deepest sympathy and concern, inasmuch as the report recently submitted by your eminence deposes that its affairs are not altogether so encouraging as we could wish. It is meet that We should follow the example of Our predecessor in the furtherance of noble projects, more especially such as are of great moment and hold out the promise of large advantage. In this spirit We are pleased to continue in the fulfillment of Our apostolic office the interest which we have long cherished toward this distinguished American foundation and even, when opportunity offers, to manifest the same more earnestly.

"Wherefore We learn with genuine satisfaction that, with the approval of all others interested in its welfare, the Trustees of the University have decided that a collection be taken up in all the churches throughout the United States annually for ten years, on the first Sunday of Advent or the first convenient Sunday thereafter, with a view of enhancing the dignity and enlarging the influence of this noble seat of learning.

"This plan, the result of their joint deliberations, We consider most likely to produce excellent results. It is, therefore, Our earnest wish and prayer that all the bishops of the country, as well as the faithful who have at heart the progress of learning and religion, should labor strenuously for the good of the university.

"That God may be pleased graciously to help this undertaking by His grace, We lovingly impart to you and the faithful committed to your care, the apostolic benediction.

"Given in Rome at St. Peter's on the 9th day of September, 1903, the first year of Our pontificate.

PIUS PP. X."

LETTER OF THE CARDINAL TO THE HIERARCHY OF THE UNITED STATES.

CATHEDRAL RESIDENCE, BALTIMORE,
Nov. 12, 1903.

Rt. Rev. Dear Sir:

I would hesitate to address you this appeal in behalf of the Catholic University of America were it not that I have been expressly re-

quested to do so by several members of the American Hierarchy. I trust that in complying with this suggestion, I am not insisting too far on a subject which has already been brought to your attention by the recent letter of our Holy Father, in which he appointed the first Sunday of Advent, as the day on which the annual collection for the University was to be taken up, in all the churches of each Diocese in this country.

This action of the Sovereign Pontiff renders more specific the decision reached by the Trustees, at their meeting in April last, regarding the support and development of the University. The Trustees, according to the Constitutions granted the University by Leo XIII., are the representatives of the Bishops of the United States, and the University is placed, by the same authority, under the direct control and protection of the Hierarchy. It is an Institution for whose maintenance and further development we have assumed responsibilities, which we must fully discharge, for the honor of the Episcopate, as well as for the reputation of the Church.

As the day appointed for the collection is at hand, I deem it my duty, in behalf of the Trustees, to place before you the needs of the Institution to meet which an appeal is now made to all the faithful of this country. That these needs are fully appreciated by the Holy Father, is evident from the fact that one of the earliest measures of his pontificate, is in favor of the University, and that his first communication to the Hierarchy of the United States, expresses his concern for the welfare of this pontifical Institution. The example which he thus gives of devotion to the interests of the Church, is worthy of his exalted station, and it behooves us, in conformity with his express desire, to carry out the undertaking, which we unanimously recommended in our Plenary Council, and for which we asked and obtained the solemn approval of the Holy See.

The reigning Pontiff, no less than his illustrious predecessor, realizes keenly the necessity of so strengthening our system of Catholic education that the generosity of our people and the devotion of our clergy, in maintaining elementary and secondary schools, may reach its fitting consummation in the work of the University. It is plain that the sacrifices made in so many ways for the education of Catholic youth, should not have as their final result the sending of those same young men, at the most critical period of their intellectual and moral formation, to institutions placed beyond Catholic control. On the other hand, if our schools and colleges are to serve successfully the purpose for which they have been founded it is necessary that their teachers be fully as well prepared as the teachers in other insti-

utions of like grade, and this preparation should be received under the salutary influence which only a well equipped Catholic university can exert.

The generous endowment of educational institutions by non-Catholics is one of the most significant movements in our national life. That Catholics, who have contributed so freely to so many other needs of the Church, are ready, in respect of educational zeal, to rival their non-Catholic fellow-citizens, we may take as an assured fact. What is requisite to direct their generosity towards the work of higher education is a clear perception of its importance and necessity.

Signal proofs of this willingness have been given already in the endowment, by individuals and by Associations, of Chairs in our University, an evidence of generosity which the Holy See, on various occasions, has greatly approved. But, in justice to their founders and benefactors, the work which they began for the advantage of the entire Catholic body, should now be brought to completion by the united endeavor of all our people, that thus every Catholic in this country may feel a direct and personal interest in the University, its work and its success.

This work is of such a nature that it must progress: it cannot safely be allowed to remain stationary. The University has a plant and endowments, amounting in all to about \$2,000,000 contributed by the generosity of our clergy and laity. It is now necessary that we make good what has already been done, by adding such endowments as will complete the Faculties, meet extraordinary expenses, and place the institution on a self-sustaining basis. For the Church in our country to do this would not require such an extraordinary effort. And once fully equipped, the University would be the source of blessings innumerable for ages to come to the young and vigorous Church of the United States. New demands are made each year upon the University for better equipment of the existing departments, and even for the establishment of other departments, without which the several courses of instruction must be fragmentary, and for that reason in no condition to attract the large number of students, for whom they are intended. An exhibit of the financial condition of the University is now being prepared, and will, as soon as possible, be placed in the hands of the Bishops; this will be done hereafter annually.

How much good our University may do in the future, when it is thoroughly equipped for its work, we may infer from the good which it has already done in the short period of fifteen years, despite adverse circumstances, and its unfinished condition. How much good it may do for the Church in this country, we may also infer from what the

Catholic University of Louvain has done for the Catholic people of Belgium. It is admitted that it has saved that nation to the Catholic faith;—a magnificent recompense for the annual collection which the Bishops order in the interest of that great school. It is an instructive fact that the Catholic University of Louvain, notwithstanding its vast student body, and the fees thence accruing, would be unable to prosecute its work, were it not for this annual collection. Leo XIII. of happy memory, has publicly registered his hope that the Catholic University of America should be to the American people what the Catholic University of Louvain is to the people of Belgium,—the bulwark of Religion and the crown of our Catholic educational system.

In all earnestness, therefore, as Chancellor of our University, I make this appeal to you, and through you to our clergy and people, in order that this first recommendation of our Holy Father, Pius X., may meet with such a generous response as to prove publicly our loyalty to the Vicar of Christ, who has asked us to make a united effort on behalf of a work, which is identical with the cause of the Catholic religion in the United States, and promises so much for the welfare of Church and country.

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,
Chancellor of the Catholic University of America.

LETTER OF THE CARDINAL TO HIS CLERGY.

ARCHDIOCESE OF BALTIMORE, CHANCERY OFFICE,
408 N. CHARLES STREET, November 10, 1903.

Rev. Dear Father:

At a meeting of the Archbishops in Washington not many months ago the decision was unanimously adopted to appeal to all the faithful in the United States on the First Sunday of Advent, November 29, 1903, for funds to carry on successfully the noble enterprise of higher education through the great University at Washington. Those Archbishops who were not present at that meeting heartily endorsed the project of their fellow prelates. The wisdom of their action cannot be questioned. Men of large experience, keenly alive to the country's needs, fully appreciating its progress in all other directions, they felt compelled to urge equal advancement in the intellectual and religious development of both clergy and laity. The judgment of these men, who are the divinely appointed leaders of Christ's flock, should, and certainly will, be accepted without demur by the faithful at large.

But a more authoritative voice has spoken. The decision of the Archbishops has been accepted, approved and emphasized by the de-

cision of the Holy See. His Holiness Pius X. has written to me as Chancellor of the University, and through me to all the Bishops of the United States, expressing his fullest sympathy with this contemplated movement, exhorting the faithful to correspond generously to the appeal, and promising the Apostolic Benediction to all who coöperate in the larger and fuller endowment of this University. And who comprehends more fully than he the benefits which the Catholic Church must derive from a University well equipped and amply endowed? The sovereign Pontiff in every age of the Church has always held universities to be a most potent factor in the spread and preservation of Christ's kingdom upon earth. Hence it was that the early history of universities is marked by the special favors and privileges conferred by the Popes on all University students, and by the rich legacies and foundations made to those high seats of learning by both clergy and laity. In a word, the Church has ever realized that the University is a great intellectual force for clergy and laity; for the clergy, since it adorns them with all the culture of their age and thereby makes them skillful in meeting the objections of adversaries of the Faith; for the laity, since it offers them the best advantages for the most scientific training.

It was then in keeping with its most venerable traditions that the Church established in the United States the Catholic University. And surely no one can deny that its foundation was timely. Behold the number of non-Catholic universities in our country! It is moreover but right that all should contribute to the support of this great project, because a University needs for its support far greater resources now than in the past. Our brethren in Europe have generously supported their universities by diocesan collections. And surely we should not be less generous nor less broad-minded than so many of our fellow-citizens, who, from no religious motive contribute so munificently to the numerous non-Catholic universities of our land. Moreover in its short life the Catholic University has already won for itself an intellectual prominence which few other universities have reached in the same period of time. All this gives good reason for presuming that its future will be bright indeed if the faithful contribute to its support with a self-sacrificing generosity born of faith in the usefulness of a university to the Church, and if at all times they lend the moral support of their sympathy and well-meaning admiration. Finally, this is the first appeal of our Holy Father, Pius X., to us, his American children, to support a work in which he manifests so much interest. Shall we not then justify his expectation to the full and make this occasion memorable by our cordial and generous support?

Kindly announce this collection at all the Masses on Sunday, November 22, as well as on the day of collection.

Faithfully Yours in Christ,

JAMES CARDINAL GIBBONS,

Archbishop of Baltimore.

P. C. GAVAN, *Chancellor.*

LETTER OF ARCHBISHOP KEANE.

ST. RAPHAEL'S CATHEDRAL, DUBUQUE,

Nov. 3d, 1903.

TO THE CLERGY AND LAITY OF THE ARCHDIOCESE OF DUBUQUE:

Venerable and Beloved Brethren:—One of the first acts of our Holy Father, Pope Pius X., has been to appeal to all the Catholics of the United States in behalf of the Catholic University of America. The text of the Papal Brief, addressed to his Eminence Cardinal Gibbons, is as follows:

Beloved Son: Health and Apostolic Benediction.

The condition of the University at Washington has enlisted our deepest sympathy and concern, inasmuch as the report recently submitted by Your Eminence deposes that its affairs are not altogether so encouraging as We could wish. It is meet that We should follow the example of Our Predecessor, in the furtherance of noble projects, more especially such as are of great moment and hold out the promise of large advantage. In this spirit We are pleased to continue, and, as far as may be, to increase in the exercise of the Apostolic office, the interest which We have ever cherished towards this distinguished American foundation. Wherefore, We learn with genuine satisfaction that the Bishops, charged with the administration of this worthy institution, have proposed, with the approval of all others interested in its welfare, that a collection be taken up in all the churches throughout the United States, annually for ten years, on the First Sunday of Advent or the first convenient Sunday thereafter, with a view of enhancing the dignity and enlarging the influence of this noble seat of learning. This plan, the result of their joint deliberations, We consider most beneficial.

It is, therefore, Our earnest wish and prayer that all the Bishops of the country, as well as the faithful who have at heart the progress of learning and religion, should labor strenuously for the good of the University. That God may be pleased graciously to help this undertaking by His Grace, We lovingly impart

to you and to the faithful committed to your care, the Apostolic Benediction.

Given in Rome, at St. Peter's on the 9th day of September, 1903, the first year of Our Pontificate.

PIUS PP. X.

To respond to this appeal of our Holy Father is for me a labor of love. Ten of the best years of my life were, in obedience to our Holy Father Leo XIII., consecrated to the task of laying the foundations of the Catholic University of America. The seven years which have since elapsed have only deepened my conviction that the future of the University is inseparably bound up with the future of the Church in our country.

In the century now opening, the welfare of religion everywhere, and especially in our land of popular liberties, will above all depend upon the perfection of the system of Christian Education. It must be a system embracing not only the elementary schools which are such a blessing to the masses of our people, and the colleges in which our picked youth are carried still further in their studies, but also the University, in which the very broadest and deepest and highest education is offered to those whom nature and Divine Providence have fitted to be the leaders of popular thought and action. If it is essential, as we all hold, that the rank and file of humanity should be rightly drilled and fitted for a life that will be both intelligent and Christian, still more imperative is it that the training of those who are to be the leaders of men should be thoroughly Christian as well as scientific.

To supply this great need was the object of the Third Plenary Council in decreeing the University, and of our lamented Holy Father in urging its establishment. Like all other institutions of great importance, its beginnings have been accompanied with many difficulties. But it has lived bravely through them all, and stands to-day the unquestioned head of the Catholic Educational System in the United States. This fact is attested by the action of most of the Religious Orders in grouping their houses of study around the University.

Thus far, the great work has been developed and carried on chiefly through the bountiful offerings of a limited number of individual Catholics, who have had intelligence enough to recognize that the noblest use they could make of a portion of their wealth was to consecrate it to the central institution of Catholic learning, so earnestly commended to them by the Holy Father and the Bishops. Now the time has come to solidify the foundations of the University forever, and to give needed development to some of its most important depart-

ments, by the combined action of all the Catholics of the entire country. Hence, this appeal made to them by the Bishops and by our Holy Father.

In compliance therewith, I hereby direct that in every church of the Archdiocese a collection for the Catholic University of America be taken up on the first Sunday of Advent. If in any locality impossible on that day it must be taken up on the earliest possible Sunday thereafter. And I earnestly request the Rev. Clergy to enter with all their hearts into the wish of the Holy Father, and to commend the cause to the generosity of their people with all earnestness.

JOHN JOSEPH KEANE,
Archbishop of Dubuque.

UNIVERSITY CHRONICLE.

University Appointments.—Rev. John Webster Melody, D.D., has been appointed Instructor in Moral Sciences. Dr. Melody is a priest of the archdiocese of Chicago. He received the degree of A.B. from St. Ignatius College, Chicago, in 1885, that of A.M. from St. Mary's Seminary, Baltimore, in 1887, and in 1889 that of S.T.B. from the same school. In 1893 he received the degree of S.T.L. from the Catholic University, and in 1903 was graduated from the University with the degree of Doctor of Sacred Theology.

Rev. Patrick Joseph Healy, D.D., has been appointed Instructor in Church History. Dr. Healy is a priest of the archdiocese of New York. He was ordained in 1898 at St. Joseph's Seminary, Dunwoodie, New York. Dr. Healy received from the Catholic University in 1898, the degree of S.T.B., in 1899 that of S.T.L., and in 1903 was made Doctor of Sacred Theology. Dr. Healy has also been made Librarian of the University.

Rev. Maurice M. Hassett, D.D., has been appointed Instructor in Church History. Dr. Hassett is a priest of the diocese of Harrisburg. He was ordained at the Seminary of Mt. St. Mary's, Emmitsburg, Md., in 1896. He received from the Catholic University the degree of S.T.B. in 1896, and that of S.T.L. in 1897. He was created Doctor of Theology at Rome in 1903.

Rev. Francis Ignatius Purtell, S.T.L., has been appointed Instructor in Hebrew. He is a priest of the archdiocese of Philadelphia, and was ordained at St. Charles Seminary, Overbrook, in 1900. He took the degree S.T.B. at the Catholic University in 1900, and that of S.T.L. in 1901.

Rev. Dr. John Spensley has been appointed Registrar of the University and Vice-Proctor of Keane Hall. Dr. Spensley is a priest of the diocese of Albany. He was ordained at Rome from the American College in 1896. He was made Doctor of Philosophy at Rome in 1893 and Doctor of Sacred Theology in 1898.

Rev. George A. Dougherty has been appointed secretary and assistant to the Rector. He is a priest of the archdiocese of Baltimore, and was ordained at Rome from the American College in 1890.

Solemn Opening of the University.—The University opened its courses on Tuesday, October 6. On Sunday, October 11, took place the Solemn Mass of the Holy Ghost. It was sung by Very Rev.

Charles P. Grannan, D.D., Acting Rector. He also presided at the taking of the oath by the professors.

Doctorate Examinations.—Three Doctors of Theology were created at the Commencement on Wednesday, June 10. They were Rev. John W. Melody, S.T.L. (Catholic University), of the archdiocese of Chicago; Rev. Patrick J. Healy, S.T.L. (Catholic University), of the archdiocese of New York, and Rev. Maurice O'Connor, S.T.L. (Catholic University), of the archdiocese of Boston. On the same occasion, the degree of Doctor of Philosophy was conferred on Rev. Charles A. Dubray, S.M., and Rev. Thomas V. Moore, C.S.P.

The Apostolic Mission House.—The edifice destined for the work of the Apostolic Missionary Union is about completed. It is hoped that at an early date it will be ready to receive its first students.

The Dominican House of Studies.—The corner stone of this edifice was laid on Sunday, August 16, by Most Rev. Diomedea Falconio, Apostolic Delegate, in the presence of a numerous assemblage. Rt. Rev. William H. O'Connell, D.D., Bishop of Portland, preached the discourse of the occasion.

The Institute of Pedagogy —The Institute which, through the courtesy of the Jesuit Fathers, had been located, during the academic year 1902-03, at St. Francis Xavier's College in New York, was transferred in October to the Cathedral College Building at the corner of Madison Avenue and Fifty-first Street. The courses of Instruction for 1903-04 are as follows:

History of Education: Rev. Edward A. Pace, Ph.D.

Principles and Methods of Education: John H. Haaren, LL.D.

Psychology: Rev. Thomas V. Moore, Ph.D.

American History: Charles H. McCarthy, Ph.D.

English Literature: John V. Crowne, Ph.D.

Genetic Psychology: Rev. Francis P. Duffy, S.T.B.

Bequest from Archbishop Katzer.—The late Archbishop of Milwaukee has bequeathed to the University the sum of \$1,800. The University acknowledges with gratitude this generous gift. Its professors and students will not fail to remember in their prayers the soul of the deceased prelate.

CONTENTS OF VOL. IX, 1903.

MAIN ARTICLES.

The Old English Chantry—Cornelius Holland.....	3
Marriage of Near Kin—John Webster Melody.....	40
Religious Liberty in the United States—Lucian Johnston.....	61
Religion as a Credible Doctrine—Edwin V. O'Hara.....	78
Vatican Syriac MSS: New Press Marks—Henri Hyvernât.....	94
John Casper Zeuss, Founder of Celtic Philology—John J. Dunn.....	179
The Puzzle of Hamlet—Maurice Francis Egan.....	191
Harnack and His Critics—Humphrey Moynihan.....	206
Old Testament Conditions and Concepts of Earthly Welfare—George J. Reid.....	225
The Mining Question—Leo Dubois.....	238
On the Italian Renaissance—Thomas J. Shahan.....	315
The Comparative Method in Literature—Maurice Francis Egan.....	332
Historians of the Medieval Papacy—Lucian Johnston.....	347
Skepticism as a Basis of Religion—Edwin V. O'Hara.....	369
Leo XIII—Thomas J. Shahan.....	447
The Ethics of the Labor Union—William J. Kerby.....	455
The Christian Agapé—James M. Gillis.....	465
Who will Build our University Church—Thomas J. Shahan.....	509

BOOK REVIEWS.

Allard—Julien l'Apostat.....	265
Amelli, S.—Hieronymi presbyteri tractatus contra Origenem de visione Esaie.....	119
Angot des Rotours—St. Alphonse de Liguori.....	263
Bachem—Staatslexikon.....	124
Bacci-Antrobus—Life of St. Philip Neri.....	263
Bain—Selections from the Poems of Ovid.....	136
Barry—The Papal Monarchy.....	403
Baunard—Un Siècle de l'Eglise de France.....	409
Bachem—Staats Lexicon.....	553
Bémont and Monod—Medieval Europe.....	400
Bennett and Bristol—Teaching of Latin and Greek.....	137
Beyaert—The Workman.....	553
Bludau—Die beiden ersten Erasmus-Ausgaben des Neuen Testaments.....	286
Bouquillon—Theologia Moralis Fundamentalis.....	416
Bourne—The Teaching of History and Civics.....	394
Bremond—Ames Religieuses, L'Enfant et la Vie.....	112
Bright—The Age of the Fathers.....	540
Brooks—The Social Unrest.....	418
Brooks—The Sixth Book of the Select Letters of Severus of Antioch.....	131
Brunetière—Discours de Combat.....	551
Channing—Discourses on War.....	557
Cone—Rich and Poor in the New Testament.....	285
Conway—The Question-Box.....	392
Coppens—A Systematic Study of the Catholic Religion.....	556

Creighton—University and Other Sermons.....	557
Dalton—Letters of Saint Theresa.....	135
Darmstetter—Abraham	120
De Broglie—Mère Marie de l'Incarnation.....	411
Defourney—La Sociologie Positiviste.....	278
De Loubat—Codex Vaticanus 3773.....	552
De Seilhac—Les Grèves.....	390
De Salviac—Les Gaila.....	261
Désers—L'Eglise Catholique.....	550
Dieu et L'Homme.....	550
Le Christ Jésus.....	550
Durham—English History Illustrated from Original Sources, 1399-1485....	558
Bells—Professor Bourne's Whitman-Legend.....	413
Fairbairn—Philosophy of the Christian Religion.....	283
Field—Letters of Charles Carroll of Carrollton.....	113
Figgis—English History Illustrated from Original Sources, 1660-1715.....	558
Fischer—The Discoveries of the Norsemen in America.....	279
Fraknoi—Innocenz XI und die Befreiung Ungarns.....	281
Franche—Sainte Hildegarde.....	406
Frémont—Les Principes	549
Gairdner—The English Church in the Sixteenth Century.....	268
Ghent—Our Benevolent Feudalism	392
Glover—Life and Letters in the Fourth Century.....	539
Guérard—Petite Introduction aux Archives du Vatican.....	105
Hall—The Lords Baltimore.....	404
Herder—Konversations Lexicon	553
Holtzmann—Die Peschitta zum Buche der Weisheit.....	412
Huck—Ubertin von Casale.....	543
Jacobs—As Others Saw Him.....	537
Janssens—Tractatus de Deo Homine.....	256
Keane—Onward and Upward.....	277
Kohlhöfer—Die Einheit der Apokalypse.....	120
Larned—Literature of American History.....	122
Laveille—Jean Marie de La Mennais.....	254
Lawler—Essentials of American History.....	115
Lebarq—Œuvres de Bossuet.....	134
Linn—The Story of the Mormons.....	402
Loisy—Etudes Bibliques	140
MacDonald—Development of the Muslim Theology, Jurisprudence and Constitutional History	518
Marie—Répertoire Alphabétique des Thèses de Doctorat es lettres des Universités françaises, 1810-1900.....	555
Mention—Rapports du Clergé avec la Royauté.....	262
Moeller—Histoire du Moyen Age.....	412
Moncrief—A Short Story of the Christian Church.....	126
Mortensen—Théâtre Français au Moyen Age.....	407
Mortimer—The Creeds.....	408
Nicolay—Histoire des Croyances.....	522
Nourrisson—Rousseau et le Rousseauisme.....	398
O'Hanlon—Irish American History of the United States.....	547
Paulot—Urbain II.....	266

Rémusat—Mémoire de ma détention au Temple.....	410
Reynier—La Vie Universitaire dans l'ancienne Espagne.....	401
Rickaby—Oxford and Cambridge Conferences.....	415
Risi—Sul Motivo Primario della Incarnazione del Verbo.....	259
Robinson—Introduction to the History of Western Europe.....	405
Roger—Die Eschatologie des Buches Job.....	120
Rose—Etudes sur les Evangiles.....	123
Saint-Léon—Le Compagnonnage.....	419
Schrader—Reallexicon der Indogermanischen Altertumskunde.....	525
Scott—Portraits of Julius Cæsar.....	535
Seignobos—History of the Roman People.....	399
Seler—Gesammelte Abhandlungen, etc.....	552
Spalding—Socialism and Labor.....	125
Specht—Geschichte der Universitaet Dillingen.....	112
Tanqueray—Synopsis Theologiæ Moralis.....	391
Turner—History of Philosophy.....	389
Vacandard—Saint Victrice.....	406
Van Den Ven—St. Jérôme et la Vie du moine Malchus le Captif.....	118
Vaschalde—Three Letters of Philoxenus.....	395
Vermeersch—De Religiosis Institutis et Personis.....	553
De Vocatione Religiosa.....	553
Voisin—L'Apollinarisme	271
Von Hammerstein—Edgar, or From Atheism to the full Truth.....	556
Von Winterfeld—Hrotsvithæ Opera.....	511
Weis-Liebersdorf—Christus und Apostelbilder.....	264
Wynne—The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII.....	555

MISCELLANEOUS.

The University and the Apostolic Delegate.....	144
Necrology: Very Rev. Dr. Bouquillon	152
Very Rev. Dr. Magnien	164
Rev. Thomas Leo Barry, S.T.L.....	298
The Pontifical Jubilee of Leo XIII (1878-1903).....	288
Ninth Annual Meeting of the Alumni Association.....	293
The Baronius Society.....	308
Installation of the New Rector.....	436
Rt. Rev. Thomas J. Conaty, D.D.....	439
Commencement Exercises, 1902-1903.....	441
The Annual Collection for the University.....	561
University Chronicle.....	170, 311, 444, 753
Notes and Comment.....	165, 300, 429

GENERAL INDEX.

- | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--------|------------------------------------|----------|
| Abraham, historical character of.. | 121 | Christianity, Harnack on..... | 208 |
| Agapé, The Christian..... | 465 | and miracles..... | 209 |
| Alumni Meeting | 293 | and the Resurrection | |
| America, and Norsemen..... | 279 | of Christ..... | 217 |
| American Antiquities, Essays on.. | 552 | and the Fourth Gos- | |
| Americana, Early | 306 | pel | 210 |
| Annual Collection | 561 | and Person of Christ | 217 |
| Anthropologists, modern | 59 | law of the land..... | 74 |
| Apocalypse, unity of | 121 | Church and State, | 73 |
| Apollinarism | 271 | Catholic Theo- | |
| Apostles, Portraits of | 264 | ries of..... | 367 |
| Apostolic Delegate, visits the Uni- | | Church, The University..... | 509 |
| versity | 144 | Clergy of France, and Royal House | 262 |
| discourse of.. | 149 | Commerce, History of Modern.... | 431 |
| Architecture, Italian | 324 | Compagnonnage, Le..... | 419 |
| Assemani, Joseph Simon..... | 94, 96 | Comte, Sociology of..... | 278 |
| Atheism | 556 | Conaty, Rt. Rev. Thomas J..... | 439 |
| | | Congregations, religious..... | 553 |
| Baltimore, The Lords..... | 404 | Creeds, The..... | 408 |
| Baronius Society, The..... | 308 | Creighton, Mandell..... | 557 |
| Barry, Thomas Leo..... | 298 | | |
| Baruch, oldest Latin Version of.. | 425 | Decalogue, the, and Superstitions. | 522 |
| Bible Studies | 140 | Decoration, Mediæval..... | 12 |
| Bibliographies, Critical | 165 | Democracy, Social..... | 390 |
| Black Death | 6 | Destiny, of Man..... | 549 |
| Books, Pedigrees of..... | 332 | Determinism | 89 |
| Bossuet, Sermons of..... | 434 | Dillingen, History of University.. | 112 |
| Bouquillon, Thomas | 153 | Divorce, Billia on..... | 434 |
| Memorial Ex- | | Doctorate Examinations | 443, 514 |
| ercises | 157 | Dougherty, George A..... | 573 |
| Brunetière, Ferdinand | 549 | Dualism, Theistic | 83, 84 |
| Burial, Ecclesiastical, in antiquity. | 435 | Duchesne, Louis..... | 110 |
| | | Dunning, on mediæval papacy. | 357, 362 |
| Carroll, Charles of Carrollton.... | 113 | Earthly Welfare, Old Testament | |
| Chantry, Specimen Charter of.... | 17 | Concepts of..... | 225 |
| Old English | 3 | Ebel, Hermann Wilhelm..... | 184 |
| Priest | 17, 33 | Echellensis, Abraham..... | 95 |
| Schools | 24 | Education, History of..... | 428 |
| Chantries, three kinds of..... | 14 | Bishop Spalding on... .. | 312 |
| and parish priests..... | 16 | Dr. Pace on Moral.... | 311 |
| Suppression of | 28 | Egypt, Marriage in Ancient..... | 44 |
| Literature of | 36 | Emerson, and the Ancients..... | 335 |
| Chapels, Domestic | 9 | Europe, Mediæval | 400 |
| Chaucer, place of..... | 333 | Introduction to history of | |
| China, marriage customs of..... | 50 | Western | 405 |
| Christ, Portraits of | 264 | Exogamy | 55 |

Fathers, Age of the.....	541	Jeanne d'Arc, Abjuration of.....	303
Feudalism, Benevolent.....	392	Jesus Christ.....	537
Fleury, and papal history.....	350	Job, Eschatology of.....	120
Florence, artistic capital of Italy.....	329	Julian the Apostate.....	265
Fourth Century, life and letters in.....	539	Julius Cæsar, Portraits of....	435, 535
France, Church History of.....	409	Katzer, Archbishop, Bequest of... ..	574
Fraticelli, the.....	545	Keane, Archbishop.....	277, 570
Free-will	89	Keats, and the Greek spirit.....	343
Frémont, Abbé.....	549	Keltic Philology, in Germany.....	188
Galla, The.....	261	Labor Union, Ethics of.....	455
Genesis, Creation account.....	423	La Mennais, Jean-Marie de.....	255
Gibbons, Cardinal, Letter to American Hierarchy.....	565	Langéron, Memoirs of.....	410
Goldsmiths, Italian, and the Re- naissance	328	Latin and Greek, Teaching of... ..	137
Gospel, Studies in the.....	123	tongue	321
Grannan, Dr. Charles P.....	311	Latium, Tribes of.....	434
Greece, marriage in ancient.....	51	Leo XIII.....	165, 288, 290, 447, 555
Hamlet, Puzzle of.....	191	Liberty, Religious in Maryland and Rhode Island.....	304
Hannis Taylor, Hon., Discourse of.....	311	Religious in the United States	61
Harnack, Adolf, and his critics... ..	206	in the Colonies.....	63
Hassett, Maurice M.....	573	Motives of.....	65
Healy, Patrick J.....	573	and the American Revolu- tion	67
Hermaneutic, General	421	Literature, Comparative, Method in	352
Hindus, Marriage customs of.....	49	Loubat, Duc de.....	552
History, Sources of	303	Magians, marriage customs of....	42
Hand of God in American	303	Magnien, Very Rev. Dr.....	164
Mediæval	412	Mallock, William.....	369
and Civics, teaching of... ..	394	Marie de l'Incarnation.....	411
Literature of American.. ..	122	Marriage, Spiritual, in primitive Church	431
Essentials of American.. ..	115	Medici, The.....	322
English, illustrated from original sources.....	558	Melody, John Webster.....	573
Papal and Gallicanism... ..	349	Middle Ages, The.....	133
Hrotswitha, Works of.....	511	Miners, Complaints of.....	243
Hungary and Innocent XI.....	281	Mining Questions, The.....	238
Hymns, Mediæval Marian.....	433	Monarchy, Papal.....	403
Incarnation, The.....	257, 259	Monism, Evolutionary.....	83, 85
Incas, marriage customs of.....	45	Mormons, History of.....	402
Indo-germanic Antiquities.....	525	Municipal Government.....	139
Industrial Commission, Report of	238, 250	Near Kin, Marriage of.....	40
Innocent XI, and Liberties of Hun- gary	281	New Testament and Poor in.....	285
Ireland, and Edward Bruce.....	166	Erasmus' Edition of	286
Israel, marriage in ancient.....	45	History of Books of	426
Israelites, economico-social condi- tions	232	Norsemen and America.....	279
Italy, in fifteenth century.....	316		

- O'Connell, Rt. Rev. D. J. 436
 Old Testament, Eschatology of.... 225
 Oxford and Cambridge, Early history of..... 432
 Painters, of Italy..... 325
 Palestine, and world-commerce.... 234
 Papal Claims, Truth of..... 303
 Papacy, Historians of mediæval
 347, 351, 354, 356
 Pedagogy, Institute of..... 574
 Persia, influence of on Jews.... 230
 Philippine Islands, Annals of.... 167
 Civilization of 303
 Philosophy, History of..... 389
 Philoxenus of Mabbogh..... 395
 Pictorial Manuscript, Mexican.... 552
 Pius X, Letter on University.... 564
 Plato and Christianity..... 323
 Prophets, eschatology of..... 229
 Purtell, Francis I..... 573
 Recluses, Female, in Middle Ages. 300
 Reformation, in England..... 268
 Religion, Philosophy of Christian.
 Credibility of..... 78
 and scepticism..... 369
 and the religious sense... 430
 the Catholic..... 556
 harmony of Religious life 131
 Rémusat, Memoirs of..... 410
 Renaissance, The Italian..... 315
 Causes of..... 319
 Revolution, Frenchmen in the
 American 554
 Rich and Poor, in New Testament. 285
 Riverside Law Suit..... 174
 Roman People, History of..... 399
 Rome, Marriage in ancient..... 53
 Civil law and Christianity. 432
 Rousseau, et le Rousseauisme... 398
 Schools, Mediæval grammar 24
 Administration of 139
 Severus of Antioch..... 131
 Scepticism, as a basis of religion.. 369
 Sleep, Mystery of..... 429
 Socialism and Labor..... 125
 Sociology, Positivist..... 278
 Soul, the Breton..... 533
 Spensley, John..... 573
 St. Alphonsus Liguori..... 263
 Cecelia, Martyrdom of..... 301
 Jerome and Vita Malchi..... 118
 tractate against Origen 119
 Francis of Assisi..... 301
 Hildegarde 407
 Philip Nero..... 263
 Theresa, letters of..... 135
 Victricius of Rouen..... 135
 Subintroductæ, Virgines..... 431
 Theatre, French mediæval..... 407
 Tennyson, and Theocritus..... 330
 and Sir Thomas Malory 338
 Theses, doctorate, in French Universities 555
 Theology, Moral..... 391, 416
 Tout, and the Mediæval papacy... 365
 Thurneysen Rudolf..... 187
 Trusts and Strikes..... 390
 Turin, Holy Shroud of..... 165
 Turner, History of Philosophy.... 389
 Ubertino da Casale..... 543
 United States, Irish American History of..... 547
 Universities, the First..... 166
 Spanish 401
 the Catholic..... 561
 Unrest, The Social..... 418
 Urban II..... 266
 Vatican, Syriac MSS. in..... 94
 Archives of..... 105
 War, Discourses on..... 557
 Whitman Legend, The..... 413
 Windisch, Ernst..... 185
 Wisdom, Syriac Translation of
 Book of..... 412
 Workman, The..... 553
 Worship, Origins of Christian.... 110
 Zeuss, John Casper..... 179
 Grammatica Celtica.... 183, 184
 Zimmer, Heinrich..... 186



CA **LH 1 .C3B7 v.9 SMC**

**Catholic University Bulletin
BCZ-0780**

9 v

